INDIA

A Journal for the Discussion of Indian Affairs.

REGISTERED FOR] [TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

No. 20. Vol. II.] MAY 1, 1891. [PRICE, PER COPY, 2d., OR 4 as. YEARLY, POST FREE, 2/6, OR 3 rs.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Advertisements	143, 144
Benares and its Officials:	
How the Recent Riots were Brought About	132
Congress, Composition of the Last	143
Hume, Mr., as a "Corrector of the Press"	132
"India Not a Free Country":	
Passages from the Congress Report, Introduction...	121
Imperial Parliament and India:	
Manipur, Military Expeditions, North-West India and Chin Hills, Consumption of Opium in India and Burma, Debate on Opium Traffic: Speeches—Sir J. Pease (123); Mr. Mark Stewart (126); Dr. Farquharson (127); Sir James Fergusson (128); Mr. S. Smith (129); Sir Richard Temple (130); Mr. Macdonald Cameron (131); Mr. W. H. Smith, Sir J. Pease, Sir R. N. Fowler, Mr. T. M. Healy (135); Names of Members Voting (135, 136); Opium Traffic Petitions, Abdul Rasoul (136); Failure of Ammunition at Manipur, Forest Regulations in Bombay, Bengal Indigo Cultivators, Permanent Settlement of Land Revenue, Discontent in the Madras Registration Department (137); Black Mountain Expedition (138); Debate on Treatment of Sheikh Abdul Rasoul: Mr. Conybeare (138-140); Sir J. Gorst (140-141); Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. W. A. McArthur (141); Report on Indian Agriculture, Manipur, Postage, Bombay Civil Service, Opium	123-131; 135-143
Keeping Faith with India: Lord Ripon on...	122
Leading Articles:	
I.—Six Generations of Loyalty to Count for Nothing	133
II.—The Opium Revenue Debate and Difficulty	134
Notes	122
Opium Traffic, Verbatim Report of Debate in House of Commons ...	123–135
Sheikh Abdul Rasoul: Debate on the Wrongful Treatment of ...	138–142

"INDIA IS NOT A FREE COUNTRY . . . . IT IS GOVERNED ARBITRARILY BY THE STRONGEST DESPOTISM."

—Sir John Gorst.

As a commentary upon the above description of the present administration of India by one of India's chief administrators, we quote, from the Introduction to the verbatim report of the proceedings at the recent Congress Session, the following passages, showing what this despotism is in practice:—

Although our present Viceroy seems not only desirous of seeing and judging for himself, but thoroughly imbued with the true spirit of Liberalism; although in every province there remain still some faithful few, who deprecate and deplore all the evil that is on foot; although throughout Great Britain signs appear that, here and there, her people are commencing to realise the grave responsibility in regard to India which has devolved upon them, the administration of India still remains, alas, as a whole,

"LINKED WITH SOME VIRTUES BUT A THOUSAND CRIMES."

Millions of educated and patriotic men (than whom no more loyal or loving subjects are numbered in the vast Empire that owns the sway of our beloved Queen Empress) are treated as political helots to gratify the class prejudices and *amour propre* and fill the pockets of a handful of bureaucrats, the average men amongst whom are, positively, less qualified for rule, in India,* than a very considerable proportion of those whom England permits them to misgovern.

India's people, free born British subjects, are denied the smallest fraction of those fundamental political privileges which, as British citizens, are their inherent birthright.

Ninety-five per cent. of all the most important and responsible offices in the country are monopolised by Europeans, on salaries fully double of those that would secure quite as, in many cases far more, competent Indians for the majority of these posts.

One-fifth of the entire population tremble on the verge of starvation, to perish by millions whenever the smallest natural calamity of drought or flood increases by one iota the insecurity of their position, and the money wrung from our pauper population, by the cruel taxation of the first necessaries of life—the money which is all our Government has had to show for

THE TWENTY ODD MILLIONS WHO IN RECENT YEARS HAVE SUCCUMBED TO FAMINE

and its consequences—is ruthlessly squandered in bloodshed, and in wicked, and idiotically mismanaged, aggressions on feebler neighbours, to gratify the ignoble cravings for personal distinctions and titles, of individual members of a Simla cabal.*

---

* Pay, promotion, and polyliteral affixes appear to be the sole things in which most of our modern civilians take any real interest. They are mere professional administrators, who take up the work simply as a matter of business as a means of making money. They are, consequently, wholly out of touch with the people to whom, with rare exceptions, they are bound by no earnest unselfish desire to do good, no real heartfelt interest in their welfare and progress. How is it that, while the civilians are comparatively well-to-do, and very powerful, and the missionaries poor and powerless, while the missionaries fearlessly attack the indigenous faiths with which the civilians never meddle, the people yet look up to so many of these missionaries with gratitude and respect, while we can number on our fingers the civilians of whom this can be said? Simply because in the missionaries the people recognise an earnest, unselfish (even if, in their opinion, misdirected) desire to help, raise, comfort and befriend them, while

IN THE MAJORITY OF THE CIVILIANS THEY CAN ONLY DISCOVER DISLIKE OF THEMSELVES,

hatred of their country, and a purely selfish eagerness to "get on" in the service! Thus represented how long can Great Britian expect to maintain unshaken, the vital hold she still, by God's blessing, retains upon the hearts of the people of India? The competitive system has failed; it has brought us shoals of well-educated men, no doubt; scarcely, in all these years, a score of faithful friends. The moral standard amongst politicians in England is so low that we can suggest no better system for appointing men there, and the only remedy, therefore, is so to work this system by granting examinations in India as well as in England, that

ALL THOSE OFFICES, DIRECTLY IN TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE, SHALL SOON BE MAINLY FILLED BY INDIANS,

who not only love England far more truly than most of her perpetually grumbling children here, but sympathise with every emotion of the hearts of their fellow-countrymen, as even the very best of foreigners never can nor could.

* All this is fully exposed in the native revelations, contained in Sir C. Macgregor's memoirs. No wonder the officials waxed indignant at this ruthless, though wholly unintentional, *exposé* of that iniquitous Afghan campaign. Nothing more damnatory of any Government ever appeared than these cruel revelations of the Lytton administration. As to Macgregor himself a couple of passages, culled almost at random, will show the spirit in which,

WITH LIGHT HEARTS, SOME OF OUR MODERN INDIAN MILITARY HEROES ENTER ON THE WORK OF SLAUGHTER.

"I do hope we shall make a good thing of it, as it will be the making of me. I should like to get one or two not very bad wounds, which would necessitate my going home. I think it is a great shame they have not brought out some honours before this. We all lose by it, and it shows a great want of appreciation of the way to manage soldiers, who should get frequent fillips during a campaign, especially a long one." Much in the same strain he writes on the 5th August: "Oh that I may get it (the vacant Brigade)! I feel sure I shall succeed, as I will anywhere on my own resources. This staff work does not suit me; it cramps and cabins one's energies and leaves me no initiative. It has played the devil with me, and if I can only escape I shall do so; if we go to Candahar and on to Herat I might possibly end by getting a V.C. after all." Here was no thought of the starving millions in India, of the honest British and Indian soldiers sent up to die at a cost that would have fed those millions; of the Afghan homesteads ravaged and burnt, and honest Afghan peasants butchered, because they fought to defend their country against utterly unprovoked foreign aggression. No, the only thought in Macgregor's mind was,

"I MIGHT POSSIBLY END BY GETTING A V.C. AFTER ALL."

What some of our nobler soldiers thought of the matter may be gathered from what another writer tells us of Sir F. Maude: "Well, one day he (Sir F. Maude) came in a state of evident irritation; he was shocked and very angry at the barbarous order which he said he was compelled to issue. 'I never thought it possible,' he said, 'that the General in command of an English force would have had to do this sort of thing; but though I must promulgate the orders I shall take care that no one is shot or hanged by me or by my order, merely because he is found with arms in his hands.' He went on to say that, so far from regarding the Afghans as criminals, he considered that the Afghans had every right to repel by force of arms 'the invaders of their country.' He was so angry—so utterly disgusted (and I could see that, though he did not mention them, he had in his mind

Almost every indigenous art and industry has been crushed, and agriculture, the one art on which now depend nearly 90 per cent. of the population, is slowly deteriorating under a grasping rack-renting system of temporary settlements, and, with it, our crops and our cattle.

The masses are being persistently demoralised; despite the distinct orders of the House of Commons, an iniquitous system of excise, calculated to stimulate drunkenness and all its attendant crimes and vices, is still retained, only slightly and superficially reformed in some provinces, in all its original iniquity in others.

Under a barbarous and obsolete system, miscalled, of Justice, Executive and Judicial, Fiscal and Police, powers are so confined in one functionary, that

POWERS PROFESSEDLY GRANTED FOR ONE PURPOSE ARE PRACTICALLY UTILIZED IN FURTHERANCE OF OTHERS,

for which no civilized Government in the world would, now-a-days, dare to confer them.

There is, practically, no justice in India for the poor against the rich, or the non-official against the official, and the police, who should be the protectors of the poor and the honest, are their terror and their worst oppressors.

What wonder, if some of us, who come of sterner sires, at times, despairing of justice at the hands of man, cry out in bitterness of heart: "How long, oh! Lord, how long?" But the patient East, sublime in its resignation and charity, longs only to forgive and to forget the *past*, and prays only for justice, however tardy, in the *present*; and wrongs that long since would have roused Teutonic or Gallic nations to frenzy, tolerated in remembrance of the civic peace and order, education, and other benefits, unquestionably conferred by England, awaken in the mind of

INDIA'S PEOPLE (FAR TRUER CHRISTIANS, THOUGH THEY KNOW IT NOT,

than that proud nation which permits all this evil, and is answerable for it, before God and man) only the mild reproaches embodied in the words with which we headed this article: "Of course we have to submit resignedly to this ruinous, this unprincipled, trans-frontier policy of the Government until we succeed in awakening the conscience of our British fellow-subjects. We are British subjects, now, of our free choice; we have thrown in our lot with England for better and for worse, and it is this which enhances England's sin in permitting the continuance of this hateful policy. Will our British brethren never awake?"

Alas! No mortal can reply. Their slumber has been long, but they may yet awake.

THE MARQUIS OF RIPON ON KEEPING FAITH WITH INDIA AND ITS PEOPLE.

Some strictures in a Yorkshire daily paper on the fate of feudatory States, arising out of the Manipur disaster, has led Lord Ripon to express himself very strongly on the wisdom, to say nothing of the policy, of respecting in India the pledges made by the British rulers of that country. Lord Ripon's letter has not attracted the attention it deserves. We quote it in full. Writing to the *Leeds Mercury*, from Studley Royal, Ripon, on the 10th of April, the Marquis says:—

"The leading article in this morning's *Leeds Mercury* on the recent sad events in India concludes with a passage upon which I beg your permission to make a few observations. It is too soon to express any opinion upon the causes of the outbreak in Manipur, or upon the course which has been pursued in respect to it. We require much further information upon the whole subject before any final judgement can be pronounced. At present we can only lament the loss of so many valuable lives, and especially of so able and distinguished an officer as Mr. Quinton.

"But the language used at the conclusion of the article to which I have referred goes beyond the particular case of Manipur, and seems to imply, though probably that was not the intention of the writer, that it is the destiny of Native States surrounded by British territory to be annexed sooner or later by the British Government. The words used are: 'Situated as it is between two British possessions, and nominally under British authority, the destiny of Manipur was to be annexed to our Indian Empire sooner or later. This revolt and its lamentable loss of life have only precipitated the date of annexation." Now, if it is to be regarded as 'the destiny' of every native state which is 'situated between two British possessions, and nominally under British authority', to be 'sooner or later' annexed to our Indian Empire, there is scarcely any native state in India which is safe from such annexation; the policy inaugurated by Lord Canning after the Mutiny would have to be abandoned; and the pledges of the Queen's Proclamation would be made worthless. Lord Canning's policy has given to India nearly forty years of internal peace; it has secured the loyalty of the Native Princes, and it concerns the honour of this country that it should be maintained. A reversal of that policy would alarm the head of every State, from one end of India to another, and I would not guarantee the tranquillity of our Indian Empire for five years after so fatal a course was adopted.

"I do not suppose that the writer of the article in which I am commenting had such a change of policy in view, but the words which he used might be taken to imply it. Knowing as I do with what remarkable keenness the language of important English journals is read by the Native Princes, I feel bound to enter my protest against the idea, too prevalent among a certain section of Englishmen in India, that it is our 'manifest destiny' ultimately to absorb all the native States now existing. I entertain so strong a feeling of the importance of maintaining unimpaired the confidence of native princes and chiefs in the strict observance on our part of the policy of Lord Canning and of the pledges of the Queen's Proclamation, that I cannot but regard the use of unguarded expressions inconsistent with that policy and those pledges as most strongly to be deprecated. I trust that no events, however calculated to excite the feelings or to move our regrets, will induce the Indian Government or the Government at home to abandon the principles which were solemnly proclaimed when the direct administration of India was transferred to the Crown, and which are regarded by the rulers of native States as the solid foundation upon which their rights securely rest.

NOTES.

At a meeting of the Wisbech Radical Club, held on April 18, to decide upon the points in the Liberal programme which the Liberal candidate, the Hon. A. Brand (who was present, and signified his acceptance of all the points agreed to), should support in Parliament, the following important resolution was agreed to: "Resolved, That this meeting considers the time has arrived for Indian Reform to be included in a Radical programme, and claims that a proportion of the members of the Indian Supreme and Provincial Legislative Councils (say, not less than one-third) shall be elected by Indian constituencies, which shall represent all races and sections of the Indian population." Liberal Associations and Clubs generally, please follow this good example.

Mr. Conybeare, M.P., is learning the lesson which Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Caine, and others, when working for India, have speedily learned. The lesson is this: never mind how unsatisfactory the official reply may be to any question put or motion made in respect to Indian affairs, good in the direction desired is sure to result. Few replies could be more unsatisfactory than were those which Sir John Gorst gave respecting the gross injustice done under the Bombay Salt Act to two women in the Kanara district. Yet, these questions have made the repetition of such cases impossible. The *Bombay Gazette*, in a leading article, says: "Now, however, we learn that the attention of the Bombay Government has been called to the matter, which is 'receiving consideration.' We believe it would be more correct to say that such instructions had already been given by the local administration —who are by no means unconscious of the objection to so rigid an application of the 'manufacture' section as was given in the Kanara cases—as make it highly improbable that for some time to come we shall hear again of old women being fined for cleaning dirty salt. If anything is still 'receiving consideration' it is the not unimportant question whether the guarantee against further prosecutions like those about which the High Court has spoken so severely shall be provided in the sweet reasonableness of the Department, or in an amendment of the law which makes these monstrous proceedings in Kanara perfectly legal. The Bombay Government, we are glad to know, have not in any degree partaken of the indifference to the rights of the subject which Sir John Gorst's answer indicated six weeks ago."

the various barbarities of burning villages, etc.), with these practices which no civilised nation would tolerate in Europe for an instant—that he went on to say

'THEY WOULD NEVER DARE TO DO THIS SORT OF THING IN EUROPE.'

Even the Russians would not resort to practices of this kind, he said; and he then went on to add sadly that it was perfectly useless his pointing out the barbarity of these things, for the 'Mutual Admiration Society' at Simla would never listen to him: and he did not belong to it, and they would pay no heed to anything he (Maude) might say. Colonel Limmond, whom I had had the honour of serving under years ago, when I was an Assistant Engineer, also spoke to me of this order in terms of the utmost indignation."

THE IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT AND INDIA.

[SPECIALLY REPORTED BY THE "HANSARD" STAFF FOR "INDIA".]

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—APRIL 7.

MANIPUR.

Sir G. CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy): I wish to ask whether the representative of the India Office can give the House any further information as to the incident at Manipur; and whether we are to understand that the Sepoys have reached their destination in safety as well as the British force.

The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir J. Fergusson, Manchester, N. E.): Thinking it probable that a question might be asked, I inquired at the India Office, and was informed that all the information possessed by the Secretary of State on this subject had been forwarded to the newspapers, consequently, I am not able to add anything. If, however, the House wishes to know anything as to the cause of the affair, I can give it, but only in a brief form.

Sir G. CAMPBELL: Then I will ask the right hon. gentleman to state all the information he is prepared to give.

Sir J. FERGUSSON: I may say very shortly, that the affair at Manipur was caused entirely by domestic differences between the Maharajah and his brother, and the former, being alarmed for his safety, took refuge in the Residency. He subsequently abdicated and retired from the territory of the State, leaving affairs in a condition in which it was not thought prudent by the Government of India to allow them to remain. Accordingly, the Commissioner of Assam went out to place things on a proper footing, and met with resistance from the brother of the Maharajah who was commanding the troops. Of course active measures have been taken to restore order and to place the government of the State on a secure footing. A despatch from the Government of India has been received on the subject and will shortly be laid on the table.

APRIL 8.

THE ACTION IN THE CHIN HILLS, UPPER BURMA.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeen, W.): I had intended to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information as to the reported death in the action on the Chin Hills, Upper Burma, of Lieutenant L. A. Forbes, of the 3rd Goorkhas; but as there is no member of the Government present who can answer the question, I will defer it until to-morrow.

APRIL 9.

MILITARY EXPEDITIONS IN NORTH-WEST INDIA.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, or the Minister who is at present representing the India Office, whether the large military expeditions to the Maranzai country, the Black Mountains, and other places on the North-West frontier of India in which Her Majesty's troops are now engaged, and in which they have already suffered appreciable losses, are in pursuance of a policy of advance sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government in this country, or are undertaken by the Commander-in-Chief in India, with the permission of the Government of India, on his own responsibility.

The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir J. Fergusson, Manchester, N.E.,): In the absence of my right hon. friend the Under Secretary for India, I have to say that the expeditions referred to in the question are not in pursuance of a policy of advance, nor has any such policy been sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government. They are punitive and pacificatory expeditions, undertaken not by the Commander-in-Chief in India on his own responsibility, but by the Government of India, subject to the sanction of the Secretary of State.

Sir G. CAMPBELL: But is it not a matter of fact that in the last two or three years, there has been a great advance?

Sir J. FERGUSSON: I cannot at this moment go into the general policy of the expeditions which have taken place on the North-West frontier of India. I have answered the specific question put by the hon. member.

CONSUMPTION OF OPIUM IN INDIA AND BURMA.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH, (Flintshire): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether he can state what was the total consumption of opium in India in 1880, and also in Burma in the same year; and what are the figures for the latest year for which statistics have been obtained for India and for Burma.

Sir J. FERGUSSON: The consumption of opium in Madras and Bombay for 1880 cannot be given. In 1889-90 it was 1,594 chests, excluding Madras and Bombay, but, including Lower Burma, the total consumption in British India was for 1880-81 5,606 chests, and for 1889-90 4,800 chests. In Lower Burma the consumption was for 1880-81 812 chests, and for 1889-90 794 chests. The consumption in Upper Burma is not known.

Mr. MACNEILL (Donegal S.): When did the consumption of opium in Upper Burma begin? Was it not forbidden by the late Government and encouraged by the present?

Sir J. FERGUSSON: I must ask for notice of that question. I believe that the consumption of opium in Upper Burma dates from a period long antecedent to that.

Mr. MACNEILL: Cannot the right hon. gentleman say, of his own knowledge, that Lord Dufferin and Lord Dufferin's Council protested solemnly against it, and that despite of that protest, Lord Cross allowed licenses to be issued?

Sir J. FERGUSSON: That question does not in the least arise out of the question on the paper.

Mr. MACNEILL (ironically): Hear, hear.

THE DISASTER AT MANIPUR.

Sir R. TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham): I desire to put a question to the Under Secretary of State for India, or the Minister representing the India Office in the absence of the Under Secretary, a question of which I have given private notice, namely, whether it is true that news has been received from Manipur that Mr. Quinton, the British Commissioner at Assam, and the British officers with him have been killed.

Sir J. FERGUSSON: A long telegram was received to-day, and was sent to the evening papers for publication. A later one, from the general officer commanding in Burma, is as follows: "General officer commanding in Burma telegraphs to-day that a messenger has arrived at Jammu reporting Grant all well at Thobal, Burma. Government also reports that British troops have occupied Ladanton-thana from Cachar side. This is only eighteen miles from Manipur. Regular troops said to be deserting Regent. Death of Quinton and those with him confirmed by letter from Head Clerk, Manipur Agency, detained by Durbar in Manipur."

APRIL 10.

THE OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Sir J. PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle): Although it has fallen to my lot on several occasions in years gone by to address this House upon the question of the Indian opium trade, I think I may honestly say that I never rose in my place for this purpose with so much of a feeling of responsibility on my shoulders as I do at the present moment. The House is well aware, individual members are well aware, of the very large and increased interest that has been taken on this subject during the last two years, especially by the people of this country, and I felt, on finding my own table, as well as the tables of my friends who are supporting this motion on both sides of the House, covered with letters and petitions, how very little any poor ability I may have, is worth in representing that which so many of the best people of this country have laid earnestly to heart. This question has never been a party question. My hon. friend the member for Kirkcudbrightshire on the other side of the House was dealing with it before I dealt with it. My hon. friend who has now come into the House, the hon. member for the Honiton division of Devonshire, before me, took a considerable and leading part in the question. My hon. friend and relative who supports me, and who is moving an amendment to my resolution, the member for the City of London (Sir R. Fowler) before any of us, I believe, took a part in the discussion of this opium question. Now, I should like to attack the entire Indian opium question. I look upon India and this country as inseparable, though that doctrine is not popular with some of my friends. But I believe it is a doctrine we have to maintain. I hold that we have to look at the interests of India and the interests of this country as identical. We practically appoint the Government of India, we practically make the laws which govern the Government of India, and we are responsible for the fact that these things go on in India under the jurisdiction of this country. In the first resolution that appeared on the paper I did not propose to deal with what is called the Malwa opium question—that is the transit duty on the opium coming out of independent States—but on looking further into the question I found that it was so intimately connected with the Indian opium question, that although if I drew degrees of morality I should not think the Malwa question is as immoral as our Indian opium question, I felt it was so bound up with the whole matter, that I am forced to deal with the transit duty as well as the cultivation of the poppy in India by the Indian Government. I think I shall show that the Malwa duty is as open to attack as any portion of the opium revenue. I look upon our connection—I say we cannot separate the Government of India from ours—I look upon our connection with the manufacture of this drug as most wretched and wicked. We cannot look upon the Malwa question with indifference. My object will be to show that opium is a drug, that it is to be treated and used as a drug, if it is to be used, but that its abuse is universally the source of human misery, demoralization, and crime. We must admit that as a nation we have, for the sake of pecuniary gain, fostered, promoted, and encouraged, the growth of the property and the sale of the property. There is no similar case in the whole history of this country where this country has become a trader in the most obnoxious article you could imagine, a trader in an article which has done damage to mankind wherever it has been introduced. We not only license the land, but we pay subsistence to the planter, we manufacture the article, we sell it for consumption, we store it in the warehouses, we send it in such quantities into the market as we feel will keep up the market price and value, we advertise the article on the main line of railway from Bombay to Baroda. On our railroad placards are posted in three Indian languages showing the Indian traveller where he can purchase this article, and we are traders in every respect in this article. I ask the House, suppose we had the entire whiskey trade under the management of this House, would there not be a great outcry in the country? Opium is far worse than whiskey is. ("Oh!") Some hon. gentleman says "Oh!" but I will prove before I resume my seat that opium is far worse than whiskey. I merely take it as a parallel. If this House had all the whiskey distilleries of the country in its hand, and advertised the whiskey, advertised it as the Indian Government do opium, what an outcry there would be amongst civilised people and amongst everyone interested in the promotion of temperance and morality. I say, and I shall try to prove, that for this greed of gain we have sacrificed every principle of political economy, that we have sacrificed every principle of morality, and that we are sacrificing every principle of Christianity. (Loud cheers.) Now I lay down as the moral law that whatever

other nations may do it ought to be no guide to us. It is no argument for us to do wrong. It is no argument for us to supply China with opium, that the Chinese are growing opium themselves. It seems to me we have no alternative but to wash our hands of a traffic which is a disgrace to our Christianity and our morality. We ought to deal with this drug as a poison. In this country the seller of opium must be a registered chemist. If he dies, his death has to be reported. Opium is scheduled as a provision in the 31st and 32nd Victoria Chap. 121. Every box, bottle, vessel, wrapper, or cover must be labelled "Opium—Poison", and be marked with the address of the seller. The *Lancet*, in a recent number, confirmed this view, and said: "Opium is from first to last a drug and a poison." Perhaps there is no testimony more affecting than that of the unhappy Coleridge. He said: "I used to think the text in St. James' that 'he who offendeth in one point offends in all' very harsh; but now I feel the awful, the tremendous, truth of it. In the one crime of opium, what crimes have I not made myself guilty of? Ingratitude to my Maker; to my benefactors injustice; and unnatural cruelty to my poor children; self-contempt for my repeated promise-breach; nay, too often, actual falsehood. After my death, I earnestly intreat that a full and unqualified narration of my wretchedness, and of its guilty cause, may be made public, that at last some little good may be effected by the dreadful example." Sir George Staunton, the representative of the East India Company at Canton, said many years ago: "It is mere trifling to place the abuse of opium on the same level with the abuse of spirituous liquors. It is (*i.e.*, the abuse) the main purpose in the former case, but in the latter it is only the exception." Sir Thomas Wade, who represented us for many years in China, gave evidence before a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the subject. The Committee in their report said: "The demoralising influences of the opium trade are incontestable and inseparable from its existence." Sir Thomas Wade said: "It is to me vain for me to think otherwise of the use of the drug in China than as of a habit many times more pernicious, nationally speaking, than the gin and whiskey drinking we deplore at home." The late Rev. Dr. Williamson, an extensive traveller and experienced missionary, said: "Its tendency to crime is most appalling. It loosens all sense of moral obligation; there is hardly an evil which I have not heard or seen perpetrated by these infatuated mortals." I put it to the House that opium is a most excellent medicine and drug, but it has to be used with the greatest possible caution. If any hon. member feels any doubt as to the medical testimony on this subject I would refer him to the wonderfully good speech delivered by Lord Shaftesbury—then Mr. Ashley—in 1844, in which he stated the opinions of all the greatest medical men of the day. It is a drug which cannot be used by any man with impunity for very long; it deteriorates the constitution and unfits a man for everything else. I intend to prove to-night from the history of China, Java, Burma, California, and our own colonies in Australia what is done by this drug in which we traffic. I have received during the last few weeks appeals on this subject from the Chinese Christians of Hong Kong, from the Christian Churches at Shanghai, from the Christian Church at Canton, from the Pekin Anti-Opium Society, and I yesterday presented a petition with 1,100 signatures from Singapore deploring the trade and imploring the Government to put a stop to the importation of Indian opium. During the last few years I have presented petitions to this House from the Convocations of York and Canterbury, from the Wesleyan Conference, the Free Church Methodists, the Baptists, the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians of England, the Scotch Church, the Free Church of Scotland, Cardinal Manning and all the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United Kingdom, the Unitarians, the Society of Friends, the missionaries in China, the Bishops of Bombay and 300 clergy of Bombay. In 1883 I presented a memorial to the then Prime Minister signed by three Archbishops, twelve Bishops, several peers, sixty members of Parliament, and thirty mayors and provosts. I think that shows how very strong the feeling in this country is. I have just received a telegram from Bombay stating that a meeting has been held there, with the Bishop in the chair, which unanimously voted in favour of my resolution. I presented to this House a petition signed by a large number, certainly the principal, clergy in this great city of London. It was signed by the Dean of St. Paul's, the Archdeacon of London, Canons Newbolt, Russell, and Long, the Archdeacon of Middlesex, Canon Farrar, and E. Carr Glynn. I presented to this House this afternoon a petition signed by 4,100 inhabitants of India. I have looked carefully through the petitions, and I have presented between 400 and 500 within the last few days to this House, and I never saw such petitions in my life, in the long experience I have had in this House. They are signed by clergymen of all denominations. I have received them from Argyleshire in the North and from Devonshire and Cornwall in the South and West. Every member of this House has been receiving petitions from his constituents on this subject. I have never seen, since I have dealt with this subject, so much enthusiasm in the country, and I have never had so many prayers forwarded to me for the success of this motion as I have had during the last few hours contained in telegrams from all parts of the country. I won't go into the question of the opinions of statesmen, because there has never been a statesman on either side of the House who has ever dared to say a word in favour of the morality of this trade. We have had the pecuniary argument over and over again—with that pecuniary argument I will presently deal; but what I have to prove at the present moment is to show what are the effects of the opium trade where it has taken hold. As regards China the history of the opium trade there is a very simple one, but a very terrible one. As regards China up to 1858, it was a contraband trade. Opium was one of the grounds for the impeachment of Warren Hastings. In 1820, opium smoking was almost unknown in China, and our trade with China in that year was 3,000 chests. In 1839, the date of the first war, we had reached 31,000 chests. In 1856, although it was contraband, it had reached 60,000 chests. The trade was legalised in 1858, and by 1862 it had reached 75,000 chests, and in 1879, it was 94,000 chests, and it continues at about 80,000 chests. But we have set the Chinese to grow it for themselves. The treaty of Chefoo was made by Sir Thomas Wade in 1876 with the Chinese under which it was proposed to leave the opium duties in the hands of the Chinese Government themselves, Sir Louis Mallet, in one of his very clear memorandums, laid down the view that, after careful reading of the Treaty of Tientsin, he was of opinion that the Chinese had a perfect right to impose any duty they liked. The English Government refused to ratify article three from 1876 to 1885. Hon. members who took an interest in the question will recollect that some of us, year after year, from 1876 to 1885, never left the Governments alone on the question. It was contrary to the policy we pursued between India and China. For nine years we held out because Lord Salisbury said we should neutralise all our policy with regard to this drug. We deprived the Chinese during these years of their power of unlimited prohibition; we drove them to cultivate their own opium. They raised the Imperial tax to £47. After May 6th 1890, either party may terminate the Chefoo Treaty, but then we fall back to our old position under the Treaty of Tientsin. What has been the effect of this opium trade on China? Out of an enormous number of testimonies which I have collected, I will give a very few, and I believe I have taken them honestly. The late Dr. Medhurst, said that calculating the shortened lives, the frequent diseases, and the actual starvation which are the results of opium smoking in China, we may venture to assert that this pernicious drug annually destroys myriads of individuals. Slavery is not productive of more misery and death than is the opium traffic, nor were Britons more implicated in the former than in the latter. Those who grow and sell the drug, while they profit by the speculation, would do well to follow the consumer into the haunts of vice, and mark the wretchedness, poverty, disease, and death, which follow the indulgence, for did they but know the thousandth part of the evils resulting from it, they would not, they could not, continue to engage in the transaction. It has been told, and it shall be rung in the ears of the British public again and again, that opium is demoralising China, and becomes the greatest barrier to the introduction of Christianity which can be conceived of. Dr. Osgood, who, in 1879, was chief medical missionary at the Hospital wrote: "I hope I shall not be accused of egotism or cant, when I write that, in my opinion, the use of opium is an unmitigated curse. I have never heard a heathen Chinaman defend the use or sale of opium, but on the contrary they universally condemn them. The only apologists have been representatives of Christian lands." Many of the North countrymen in the House would know the name of David Hill. His son gave me the following, and I asked him to write it down. He was a missionary in the centre of China. "The effects of opium smoking upon the Chinese has again and again been depicted to the British public in strong and earnest language, never I think too strong, certainly never too earnest. No language could fully picture to others the deplorable consequences of opium smoking which I myself have seen in China, even in the case of some of my own Chinese acquaintances." That gentleman told me that when he went into one of the interior provinces, the city walls were placarded with papers warning the people against his coming, as it was the missionary who brought the opium trade and who brought Christianity. The two things were coupled together and if we are a Christian people, which I trust we are, I hope we may take away from ourselves the curse of preventing the spread of what we believe to be the purest form of religion amongst these poor heathens. I have several more quotations. Mr. Frederick Porter Smith, founder and manager of the Hankow Medical Mission Hospital, Central China, said, "I wish to place on record that, after an intimate acquaintance with the people, the literature, the language, and the commerce of the large provinces of Central China, I am compelled to describe the infatuation, the miserable saturation of the country, the 'change of type' of the character of the nation, and the miseries wrought upon individual habit, constitution, temper, and fortune, all exhibited in the course and consequence of the vice of opium smoking, in China as forming an unique instances of national lunacy and suicide. No epidemic possession of any people or sect contains such terrible details as are afforded by the simple story of this horror. At the same time I protest against gratuitous exaggeration being imported into the question now able to take care of itself." Dr. Pringle wrote to the Lord Mayor: "If those who have spent as I have spent thirty years in India and came forward on behalf of poor China, I am certain a weight of practical evidence would be forthcoming which would swamp anything that could be opposed to it, and would end in the Government of India washing its hands of what without doubt in these days of increased education in India is viewed as a sad blot in the rule of a Christian power." The other day I presented a petition to the House signed by all the Protestant missionaries in China. I will only read one or two extracts: "The connection of the British Government with the trade in this pernicious drug creates prejudice against us, as Christian missionaries hinders our work. It strikes the people as an inconsistency that while the British nation offers them the beneficent teaching of the Gospel, it should at the same time bring to their shores a drug which degrades and ruins them." They describe opium as "a great evil to China; the baneful effects of its use cannot be easily overstated. It enslaves its victim, squanders his substance, destroys his health, weakens his mental powers, lessens his self-esteem, deadens his conscience, unfits him for his duties, and leads to his steady descent, morally, socially, and physically." That was the evidence of the missionaries. There was a stronger testimony even than that; it was a letter from Archdeacon Wolfe of the Chinese mission. He says, "The people are being ruined by it, and it is indeed a lamentable spectacle to see professing Christian men speaking and writing in defence of the horrible crime. The pernicious results of this soul and body destroying vice are apparent all around, cadaverous-looking faces meet one on every side, and the slovenly habits, and the filthy appearance, of the people generally testify too plainly to the evil it is working on this once industrious and energetic population. The rapid progress which opium smoking has made during the last twenty years among all classes of this population is a very serious matter for us missionaries. Humanly speaking, opium smokers are beyond the reach of conversion as the vice unfits them for the perception of any moral or spiritual truths. Can the Church of Christ in England do nothing to influence the nation to withdraw from the abominable traffic which is causing so much moral, spiritual, and physical, ruin to this great people? It is a sad reflection on the Church of Christ in England that it seems powerless to influence the English people in so important a matter as the Indian traffic in opium. Almost the entire population in some places is abandoned to the use

of this poisonous drug. The effects are witnessed in the extreme poverty of the people in the broken down and dilapidated dwellings all through the village, and in the gross immorality which prevails amongst the inhabitants. Men openly and without shame prostitute their wives in order to procure for themselves the means of indulging in opium smoking. Little children are sold as slaves and turned away from the embrace of their helpless mothers in order that their degraded fathers may have money to buy opium. All this and much more may be told of the effects of opium smoking on the miserable people. Yet professing Christians in England see no harm in it and openly advocate the abominable traffic which makes it possible and comparatively easy for the Chinese people to ruin themselves and their wives and children for time and for eternity. It may be said on the other side that this state of things in China did not entirely arise from our action with regard to the traffic in opium. Certainly not, and no one for a long time has said that it did; but at any rate we are participators in that trade. We are sending out 80,000 chests of opium a year to China, and therefore are helping largely to produce that state of things. The Indian Government are trying to make a profit out of that trade, and although it is becoming smaller we are keeping it up as much as possible. There is one argument which has been used in this House again and again and therefore I will not attempt to go into it. I think I hear the voice of the hon. gentleman, the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell). I remember that he said a few years ago that it was better that the people of China should be poisoned by our good opium than by the bad opium they produce themselves. That may be regarded as an argument by the hon. gentleman, but I do not think it is one that will have the assent of the House. I will now refer to a statement made by a gentleman in a publication, the last edition of which I had the honour of publishing in conjunction with my late excellent friend, who I may say was one of the greatest ornaments this House has ever had (Mr. John Bright). Mr. Dymond there said: "If I were to sell a man arsenic or a pistol knowing that the buyer wanted to commit murder, should I not be a bad man? If I let a house knowing that the renter wanted it for purposes of wickedness, am I an innocent man?" Mr. Dymond treats the argument, "That if I did not do it some one else would" as follows: "Upon such reasoning you might rob a traveller on the road if you knew that at the next turning a footpad was waiting to plunder him. To sell property or goods for bad purposes, because if you do not do it some one else will, is like selling slaves because you thought it criminal to keep them in bondage." Now, Sir, I have done with the case of China, which I have only used as an illustration of what the traffic in opium does. I have not said we could get the Chinese Government to alter their plans, I have not said we propose to try to get the Chinese Government to do so. My case is that we ought to put our own house in order, that we ought to have clean hands in regard to this business, and it does not make the slightest difference when it is said that China now grows opium for herself. Let us, if we can, be moral and do what is right, independent of all other considerations. I now come to Burma. There can be no doubt that we introduced the opium trade into Burma. An official report of the Government in 1870 states that "Opium eating is not a Burman habit; it is a new vice." The report of the Burma Baptist Missionary Convention of 1866 states that "the Burmese as a race were remarkably free from the use of intoxicating drinks and drugs fifty years ago." The Rev. C. Bennett said: "When I first arrived in the country in 1830 opium was rarely used and almost entirely confined to Chinamen. There were, however, a few Burmese who used it, and they were looked upon by their countrymen as outcasts and worse than thieves." It is said that we are trying to prevent the use of this drug in the opium houses, that we have pulled down a great number of these houses, but still the number of opium houses in Burma is almost kept up, and the smaller number sell almost as much opium as was formerly sold by the larger number. A late traveller in Burmah states: "It is perfectly true that there is only one opium shop in the Akyab district dealing directly with the Government. But this opium shop distributes the Government opium to many hundreds of other shops. I myself saw yesterday at Akyab fifty of these dens in less than forty-five minutes. The number of smokers in each den was from four to eight. The great majority of them were Burmans. These fifty dens lay all around one of the chief police stations of the district, and within a gun-shot of the Custom House. Mr. Htoonkyawoo told me that his estimate of the number of dens in the Akyab district, the town included, was at least 1,000, all supplied by the one licensed shop which appears in the Government report. If this rate is correct, the thirty shops we have been told so often are the only ones in Burma represent 30,000 others. Certainly I can scarcely imagine any town in China worse than the portion of Akyab that I visited. The shops lay three and four together and entire streets seem to consist, to a large extent, of these opium dens." I have always wondered how any member of this House can get over the testimony which has been so often read of Sir C. Aitchison although, in my opinion, his testimony is not so strong as that of some of his subordinate officers. He shows in the report I hold in my hand, but which I will not read, that the land is in danger of going out of cultivation owing to this drug, that the people are emaciated by it, that it saps both physical and mental energies, that it predisposes them to disease, induces indolent and filthy habits, destroys self-respect, is one of the most fertile sources of misery, destitution, and crime, that it fills the gaols with men of relaxed frame predisposed to dysentery and cholera. This report is more than confirmed by the subsidiary officers who furnish information on the same subject. But I may be told that the Burmese people are weaker people constitutionally than the Chinese. But surely difference of constitution cannot account for one people being benefited by the drug, and the other being materially reduced in their moral and physical being. I see that in the Government proposals with regard to the people of Burma there is a report signed by Lord Dufferin, C. P. Ilbert, T. C. Hope, A. Colvin, G. Chesney, and J. B. Peile. They say no shops whatever will be licensed for the sale of opium inasmuch as all respectable classes of Burmans are against legalising the consumption of opium in the new province. Any one found selling opium to persons other than to Chinese or transporting opium in quantities above three tolas, or keeping a saloon for consuming opium, will be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding Rs. 500 or three months' rigorous imprisonment or both. As traffic in opium was absolutely prohibited under the Burmese Government, there will be no hardship in thus proscribing opium dealings. This report is written and signed by the Governor-General of India, the very country for which we are trying to keep up the opium revenue. I think I have proved that this traffic has done great damage both in Burma and in China, and I say the time has come when we ought to clean our hands of any participation in a traffic which produces so much moral and material injury. I do not propose to deal with the damage done to the people of India. That point will be taken up by my hon. friend who is to follow me. We know the effects that have been produced not only in those places but amongst those who have gone forth to our colonies in different parts of the world. Only the other day a very curious case occurred. In the month of March meetings were held in the city of Amsterdam for the purpose of inducing the Dutch Government to put a stop to the opium trade in Java. Java in 1815 had an English Governor, Sir Stamford Raffles, who put down the opium trade by decree. In 1816 it was opened again by protests from Bengal. The Dutch Government rule in Java over 22,000,000 of people. Amongst whom are 250,000 Chinese. Well, services were held in Amsterdam at nearly every church, and meetings were held, for the purpose of impressing upon the Dutch Government the necessity of stopping this iniquitous trade which, as I have already shown, was re-opened in consequence of protests from the Bengal Government. In California there are as we know a large number of Chinese, and there was a municipal law for the suppression of the vice of opium smoking. That law afterwards became a statute of the State of California. It is enacted that "every person who opens or maintains to be resorted to by other persons any place where opium or any of its preparations is sold or given away to be smoked at such place; and any person who at such place sells or gives away any opium or its said preparations to be there smoked or otherwise used, and every person who visits or resorts to any such place for the purpose of smoking opium or its said preparations is guilty of a misdemeanour, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding 500 dollars or by imprisonment in the county gaol not exceeding six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment." These people have taken the bull by the horns, and endeavoured to put an end by law to a vice which was deterioriating and demoralising their population. Having now dealt with Java and California I come nearer home. The other day I had a call from a gentleman who was lately a member of the Victorian Government at Melbourne. He gave me this letter: "My Chinese friends who are working with me to secure the removal of the opium curse desire me to take this opportunity of wishing you 'fair wind and favourable tide' both on your voyage to the land of your fathers and on your return to this the land of your adoption; and to thank you very cordially for the warm sympathy, wise counsels, and powerful assistance you have rendered the cause of our suffering countrymen ever since the commencement of the movement for the prohibition of the accursed traffic in this and the adjacent colonies. But much as we know you have done we feel sure that you will be only too glad to do much more to forward the cause of the poor victims, wherever and whenever opportunity offer you. We thought, therefore, that as you are proceeding to the United Kingdom, which still holds the key to the whole situation, we would be failing in our duty if we do not entrust you with the prayers and tears of the thousands of victims in this colony alone who are held spellbound by this fell destroyer. You, yourself, have seen its terrible havocs in your midnight visits, and can therefore make far more forceful representations to 'the powers that be' than any description of mine." That is signed by a Chinese gentleman—one of the leading Chinese Christian men in Australia. That is the history of the deputation to Mr. Deakin, who is at present a member of the Government in Victoria. These Chinese gentlemen, who compose the deputation, speak in exactly the same way as our missionaries in China speak. The Rev. Mr. Allan speaks similarly, and so does Canon Parker, another English gentleman. Then what does the Governor say in reply to this deputation? I dare not read what I should like to read in some extracts from the speeches on this occasion. The Governor says:—"There was but one feeling amongst the Government on the subject. He did not think, however, that the sum of £20,000, or to be correct, £18,000 a year, was a sum to be depreciated, and he did not think that Parliament, or the Government, would be called upon to throw away that sum unless occasion justified it. In this case the moral weight which attached to the objections to the traffic, which had been properly termed infernal, made the point one about which there could not be the slightest difference of opinion." Then the Government at Melbourne addressed a letter to the other Colonies asking them to co-operate in their representations, in order to put an absolute prohibition upon the sale of opium in those colonies. Now, Sir, I cannot understand how right hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and right hon. gentlemen here can come down to this House, after all that testimony from China, and all that testimony from other parts of the world which I have read, and say that there can be any justification of this opium trade, except opium is used for recognized and legitimate purposes. It would not be for me, for one moment, to depreciate the very distinguished services of my hon. friend, the member for the Evesham Division. His name will ever be associated with Indian history, and with regard to my hon. friend behind me, I must make a similar observation. The former in his evidence, before the Committee which dealt with this subject, says that the Indian Government looks for revenue, and he does not hesitate to say that the consequences of the opium trade do not come before the Indian Government. Indian officials in this House generally take that view. They tell us there are people who consume opium with great advantage to themselves. I do not believe it for a moment, but they tell us so, and they think they have seen it. The medical evidence is entirely on the other side, but, even if it be so, the proportion of those who receive benefit from the use of opium is infinitely small, compared with the thousands upon thousands who are demoralized by it. China has made a Treaty with America prohibiting opium; England has made a Treaty with Corea prohibiting opium. I am not going into the question, as I see my time is limited, but it is a fact that our trade with China has not increased at all during many years past. We see that it is less than it was in 1868. We have a trade with Japan; we have not introduced opium into

Japan. Our trade with Japan in 1868 was £1,200,000: our trade in 1889 was £4,000,000. I believe we are standing very much in our own light, in regard to this traffic. If the eleven millions in silver which China pays us for opium were paid to us for goods from Manchester or Leeds, the results would be very much more beneficent, and it would be very much better for this country. I shall now endeavour to touch on the Malwa question, and I will tell the House why I have incorporated the Malwa duty. I have done it for this purpose. I find, from the Moral and Material Progress Report of India in 1888 and 1889, that the States, engaged in the cultivation and production of opium, so arranged and managed it as to safeguard the British revenue, and in exchange for this service they received compensation in money or in some other form. What has been the course of the Malwa duty? The Malwa duty was Rs. 650, it was raised to Rs. 700, again reduced to Rs. 600, and now is Rs. 600 per chest. In 1880-1 there was a trade of 36,000 chests; in 1889-90 it got down to 30,000, and it is now down to 28,000 chests. By lowering the duty they get more opium to poison still more people, although they get less money for doing so. A late traveller in Rajputana says, "The condition of the people is deplorable. The poppy grows on their finest land. Instead of food being grown and stored in good years, the poppy is in possession. The last famine in Rajputana was owing in great measure to this cause. Opium takes up the cotton and food lands. Lately cotton and food were turning out the poppy, and food in price has gone down twenty-five per cent. What do these people of Rajhputana get out of the trade? The selling price in 1888 and 1889 was Rs. 1,120 per chest. The pass duty was Rs. 650. The cost to the Indian Government over ten years has been Rs. 390, or latterly Rs. 410 the chest; but taking it at Rs. 390, that is to say, we walk off with about £1,320,000, and hand over to these natives for their opium about £180,000. I do not think we are doing them a very great kindness, so far as the pass duty is concerned, in promoting the cultivation. Of course, the native Princes get a higher rate out of the land which is devoted to the cultivation of the poppy." But there is a memorandum I see by Dr. Keegan, who says: "The results of the depression of the opium trade in Malwa are far-reaching. The means of livelihood of a large body of cultivators who find themselves unable, with the low prices obtainable for the produce, to defray the expenses of cultivation, and to pay the heavy State opium assessment are seriously affected, while the States whose revenues depend largely on their opium assessments, are likely to find them considerably diminished." Even with regard to Malwa we do not seem to be doing the people a very great kindness by levying a duty of even 600 rupees. These people are starving on the opium land; they are in a very poor condition, and they are demoralised. Well, now I come to that more difficult part of my subject, and I own it is very difficult—the Indian revenue. The largest revenue that ever was obtained from opium by the Indian Government was in the year 1880-81, when they received from both sources, the transit duty and the other source of revenue cultivation, Rx. 8,451,000 from Bengal (North) and Malwa. The largest value during that period of the rupee was 1s. 8d., so that our Indian revenue was over £7,000,000. But that revenue has fallen very steadily. In 1888 and 1889 the two revenues together made Rx. 5,900,000 instead of Rx. 8,400,000, or about £4,000,000. The Budget estimate, telegraphed the other day, put the sum at £3,989,000; you may call it £4,000,000, and that is the figure with which my motion practically has to deal. This is a very awkward item in Indian finance. At least £2,000,000 worth has been drawn out of stock in the last three years in order to keep up those revenues to about £4,000,000. That is about £500,000 a year that has been drawn out of stock, which reduces the figures or factors we have to deal with to about £2,500,000. But the amount in advances for cultivation in India is, I believe, now upwards of £1,000,000. The amount of capital invested in stock is above £1,000,000. If you deduct the interest on that stock, and the capital value of the works, you further decrease the sum with which we have to deal. I do not believe a wise accountant would put the Indian capital at the present moment at more than £3,500,000, at the very outside. And that is the figure with which we have to deal, and it is for that amount we are doing so much mischief to mankind. Now, with regard to the Indian revenue, I am very glad to see a surplus in 1890-91 of £2,000,000. In 1889-90 there was very nearly the same surplus. It is a large surplus, and I have no doubt there are many uses in India for that surplus. But I think the Indian revenue from this source is a doomed revenue. A pamphlet circulated to-day in relation to China, states that though the consumption of opium has increased, the consumption of Indian opium has very much decreased. What do our own people say? In regard to moral and material progress, in 1881 and 1882, they say the poppy is being slowly replaced by the potato and sugar-cane. "The system of advances is reported to be the chief inducement to the cultivators to grow so precarious and troublesome a crop as the poppy. The efforts of the sub-agent to extend the poppy cultivation in Agra, Muhtra, and Aligar, were not attended with success. Sir Evelyn Baring in 1885 said a diminishing revenue might be expected. This was true, though the fact was not mentioned that it had sometimes been necessary to increase the number of cultivators in order to prevent a diminution of the area cultivated. The Indian Government has reduced the revenue from opium from 7,000,000 rupees to 4,000,000, and I think it is reducible to about 3,500,000 rupees. The value of the drug has gone down considerably, and the quantity offered for sale has also gone down considerably. When I come to look at the finances of India there are several things which attract attention. One is the large amount which is constantly being placed on the revenue, which any corporation or other body dealing with funds would apply differently. The expense of the army of India in 1881-82, after the Afghan War was Rx. 13,000,000; in 1884-85 it was Rx. 16,000,000; and in 1888-89 it was Rx. 20,000,000. Therefore the Indian army alone has cost us £5,000,000 a year, more than it did before the Afghan War. Those who know anything about the Indian army have always understood that very great economies have been effected and maintained. There are points in connection with the Indian army which any man knows ought to be attended to, and every man in India who has borne the name of a distinguished soldier has advocated changes. My hon. friend and relative, the member for the City, has placed on the paper an addition to my motion if it comes to be the substantive question, relative to subsidies from this country. I have always advocated that if we ask, in this House, the Indian Government to make a sacrifice on moral grounds, we ought to do as we did in connection with the Slavery Question—meet them by some subsidy. My hon. friend has, however, drawn his resolution a little too wide. If my motion comes to be the substantive motion, I think we should amend his by saying: "This House is of opinion that such annual grants should be made to the Government of India as the then probable amount of deficit and the then circumstances of Indian finance seem to require." I do not think the Indian Government can look, as I am sure they do not look, for a long continuation of this opium revenue; but the more I have looked into the question the more am I convinced that India itself would be a great gainer by doing away with a trade which demoralises its population, and certainly adds very much in many ways to its expenses and its charges. I trust I have proved that this trade in which we are engaged is the curse of China, has been and is, I am afraid, still the curse of Burma. My hon. friend opposite will prove it is the curse of India. It is being rooted out because it has been a curse in Australia; the Dutch are anxious to root it out because it is a curse in Java: and it is a curse of the American population in California. I have shown that every thinking man on whose opinion we place confidence—that certainly all the heads of our Christian churches—look upon this question as I look upon it, as a question of Christianity. I have also shown that the revenue from the traffic is an uncertain one—that it is fading away; that the crop occupies good ground which ought to be devoted to more legitimate trade; and I trust I have shown it is a disgrace to Christianity. I am not advocating any breach of faith with those Indian States who have so often been loyal to the English Crown. I do not know what are the treaties, or what may be the nature of agreement; but I have never made use of the argument that there is not legitimate trade. Surely we might do a legitimate trade to the extent of many hundreds of thousands of pounds by producing opium in India to supply our legitimate trade at home and abroad! At the present moment medical requirements are supplied entirely by Turkey or Persian opium, the Indian opium being manufactured entirely for Chinese consumption. I appeal to Her Majesty's Government and to the House to do away with this horrible traffic, which is demoralising and destructive to mankind. I appeal on the ground of those laws which ought to regulate the dealings of mankind; but I appeal on still higher grounds. I appeal on a ground which is not often urged in this House, but a ground on which I believe I shall have the sympathy of a large number of members in this House—the Christian ground. We call ourselves a Christian country, and I trust we shall long remain one. Many of my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House maintain a State Church, because they hold, what I consider still, a beautiful ideal—that we acknowledge a Supreme Being and worship Him. In this House we have prayers read every day, and we pray that God's kingdom will come upon earth. If we go on with this opium trade we cannot spread God's kingdom. We shall spread the kingdom of the Devil. The evidence is strong in favour of the motion which I have ventured to bring forward, and I pray that this House in its wisdom may see right to put an end to this traffic, which I have endeavoured to describe in language which I believe to be true.

Mr. MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbright): After the very exhaustive speech of my hon. friend, I need not trouble the House at greater length than I can possibly avoid. In 1875 I brought forward a motion for the gradual diminution of this trade, and had that resolution been carried we should have been saved a great many heart-burnings and great difficulty in this question. To-night we approach a resolution of a much more drastic character, and one which may possibly not commend itself to every member in this House. I have submitted the resolution which appears in my name on the paper because I believe it to be a thoroughly practical one, and one which would have commended itself to the majority in the House. But having the honour to second the motion, I wish to say a few words in its support. The point to which special attention is directed is this, that while the Government of India asserts in this House that the opium revenue is diminishing, and that they are doing what they can to put down the opium traffic, we find a very much larger consumption of opium is taking place. If I take the instance of Lucknow, I find that in the year 1883-84 there were only twelve shops licensed for opium smoking; in 1885-86 they were reduced to six, and in 1887-88 to three; but on the other hand, the consumption in those shops very considerably increased, namely, from 36,000 tolas in 1883-84 to 41,000 tolas in 1885-86, and to 64,000 tolas in 1887-88. This very large increase in the consumption of opium has nothing to do with China, and that statement must fill us with alarm and consternation. The only remedy for such a state of things is the suppression or withdrawal of the manufactured goods. Opium smoking is considered a disgrace. It is said the only thing that saves the nation from utter extirpation at once is the virtue of their women, and if a woman smokes it is considered such an unrighteous and unholy thing that even opium smokers are dead against that view. I wish to direct attention to the case of Akyab, the capital of Arakan, in Lower Burma. The dealers go about the country and establish centres, following the three great lines of railway. It was one of the strictest rules under the late King Theebaw that no person should be allowed to smoke or chew opium, and that rule was rigidly enforced. Now we find that the consumption of opium in the country ruled by him had decreased largely, while in Lower Burma it was rapidly on the increase. In Lower Burma the smoking of opium has increased since last year, and there is a very large increase in the amount consumed by the population over which this country bears rule. Now we are told by Government documents that opium is only sold to the Chinese, but that is not the case at all, I have seen numbers of Burmese go openly into the shops and buy opium. I have many cases on record where the consumption of opium is encouraged among persons who have not known its delights and pleasures before. These are at first given opium of much milder character and not so strong as other kinds, and after becoming accustomed and habituated

to its smoking, then they are given the opium of British India. There can be no doubt of the great facilities which are given now for the sale of opium among the native populations of India. Till recently there was little opium, comparatively speaking, used in India. There was a little used in the Punjab. But now it is calculated that something like 122,000 cases are consumed annually by the native population. That shows the enormous increase that is going on in the manufacture of opium. To curtail the facilities at present existing for its manufacture would not be so hard on the people as some persons might be disposed to think. There is an enormous quantity of the best land under the cultivation of the poppy, and a great deal of labour is required. Now that labour could be utilised in growing food and cotton. Many parts of India, we know, are extremely cold, and the people are in a bad way when they cannot obtain warm clothes. It would conduce to the health of the people to put down the cultivation of the poppy and in favour of the cultivation of cotton. We have an enormous amount of testimony as to the condition of the people owing to the opium trade, and we cannot question the value of these authorities. Those who write know the habits of the people, and can get at the popular mind and the popular wishes in a far better manner than ever before. Their unanimous opinion is that so long as the opium trade continues great evils will exist, and they are most anxious to do away with the whole thing. They say that it is a very grave state of affairs, that we who set up to be the most civilised nation in the world should set such a bad example to these people, and that we are fast losing our character in all parts of the East. It is absolutely impossible to remedy this state of affairs as long as this opium trade exists. We should not make the people bad by bringing in opium amongst them, but should encourage higher aspirations founded on better principles, and should introduce trade not mixed up with opium, and bring the people to truer lights. Some people say, Well, after all we have the consumption of alcohol at home to consider and get rid of before we go to India about the opium. (Hear, hear.) But the two things are quite different. The quantity of opium which would poison the whole population of London is twenty cases, whereas, twenty cases of alcohol would only perhaps cause a few people to be locked up. Then opium is despised amongst the people who employ it most. Again, the Government is not so mixed up with the sale of alcohol as it is with opium. If the Government were so much connected with the manufacture of distilled spirits in this country as they are with the manufacture of opium we should hear a great deal about it. But they do encourage the trade in opium. There are officials to examine the opium and pick out the good stuff. The bad lots are sold throughout India. The Chinese have a strange prejudice against us, and when I see that I say that something must be wrong. This is owing to the opium trade and it is our duty to remove that prejudice. If we remove that prejudice they will enter more easily into commercial relations with this country. If we put a stop to the opium traffic we should have fewer people in our jails and fewer people in our lunatic asylums. I think I might just mention another intoxicant, ganja, the manufacture of which has also increased, but I don't propose to go into that. Another point is this. It is often said the carriers in India are better for the use of opium, but the fact is that those who have never had a dose of opium are better bearers than those men who are addicted to its use, and who without it would simply fall down and be unable to proceed another yard. Then with regard to fever, it was said by those experienced with the fever and malaria districts that those who did not eat or smoke opium were much safer than those who did. Just one word, before I sit down, upon our Settlements and Colonies—Singapore, Hong Kong, and Shanghai. The local Government derive a large revenue from the sale and manufacture of this drug in these places, but in Rajapatam where no opium is allowed to be sold, the state of things is much healthier. In regard to these Settlements, a very remarkable movement took place on the 17th of July in last year. A great number of the merchants met together to forward petitions to the House of Commons of the British Parliament praying for the prohibition of the growth, manufacture, and sale of opium. That petition was signed by 1,000 persons in a few hours and amongst them were many opium smokers. I would also like to say a word about the opium farms of Singapore, because we are told the Government are doing all they can to discountenance the further sale of opium. These opium farms are tenanted by Chinese, and as they are very poor tenants, the Government have lowered the terms to enable them to carry on their farming operations, which does not look like discountenancing the sale of opium. From Hong Kong the people have petitioned the House of Commons to pass a stern law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of opium there. Another petition was against the use of the Chinese contract system. One Chinaman takes a contract in consequence of which we are told there is only one contract, but this man may give 500 sub-contracts on licenses and he does so. In many cases contracts have been given in order to set up this trade until it is now almost impossible to stop it. I beg to apologise for having detained the House so long on a subject somewhat old, but I am firmly persuaded that the growing feeling in this country is such, that it will force the hand of the Government, and cause them to ponder before they allow this manufacture to go on. I am strongly satisfied the feeling is a ripening one and that at the next election it will be made a test question in many a constituency. I do not say this for the purpose of catching votes to-night, but because I am representing what I believe to be the growing feeling and the demands of the country.

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire): I am very unwilling to give a silent vote on this occasion, because, in the first place on my own side, I have a strong conviction; and, next, because I feel placed in a position of some delicacy in this matter. Before I go further in this matter, I wish, in justice to my constituents, to absolve a certain influential section of them of any complicity in the action I am taking, because, and I say it with deep regret, I am going against the wishes of a certain influential and respectable section of my constituency. I have presented to this House a large number of petitions in favour of the motion before the House, and I have had many letters from highly respectable clergymen in my constituency urging me to vote for this resolution. It is only a strong sense of duty that compels me on this occasion to say a few words in opposition to the wishes of my best friends and supporters. But I think it is the duty of any one who thinks he can say a word in defence of the position we take up in this matter, to get up, regardless of the consequences to himself, and to say that word, as I hope I shall, in a straightforward manner. If all the statements made to-night could be proved, I should have no hesitation in saying I would follow my hon. friend who sits below me into the division lobby; but these statements are founded on misconceptions, and, therefore, I shall feel it a duty to vote the other way. We have not had trotted out to-night the statement that we force opium upon the Chinese, I suppose that old invention is now given up. (Cries of "No, No.") Well, I am sorry I have started that hare, because I am afraid I shall have to give it a little run; but as I have pointed out before—and the officials in charge of the Government of India have pointed out also—it is impossible for any one now to say we have forced opium on the Chinese. (A laugh.) That laughter may be a convenient method of getting rid of an inconvenient question, but we can show upon eminent authority, adopted by Lord Ripon, that the opium war was a war of treaties, and that the Chinese people had the opportunity, if they liked, of excluding opium from the three hundred articles: but they declined to give up the revenue, which they knew to be an important one, but one, which, by giving fifteen months' notice, they could put an end to. We must look at this matter from a serious point of view, and see what the effect of giving up this revenue would have upon India. I prefer to take my views, and form my conclusions upon the opinions and evidence given by the Governor-General. And they tell us—and Lord Ripon, who is, above all things, a man of sober judgment, tells us in so many words—that India would be bankrupt if we remove the opium revenue from it. There is nothing more taxable in India, and, therefore, the only way of getting rid of this opium revenue would be to tax the people of this country threepence on the income tax. (Hear, hear.) I am stating this as the only alternative. If England desires to do that they may; but I agree with the words of the late Mr. Fawcett, who said it would be in the highest degree absurd to spend money in stopping this traffic when we have at our very doors, round the corner, a traffic in alcohol from which we derive an immense revenue, which causes far more widespread misery than opium ever did or could do. There are only two alternatives in dealing with this matter. The one is to prohibit opium-growing in India, and that would be impossible, for we know that there are many large estates in India where the growth of opium is obliged to be permitted, and to prohibit the growth of opium and thus make India bankrupt would not be any benefit to China, because it is a fact well-known that two-thirds of the opium used in China is grown upon Chinese territory. We also know from the highest Chinese authorities that the issue of edicts against the growth of opium in China must be taken in a Pickwickian sense; they are issued for the delectation of the world but not intended to be acted on, or at all events, they have never been acted upon. If acted upon I should like to know of any authentic case of a Chinaman being beheaded or put to death for breaking the law. The second alternative is to allow free trade in opium, to allow opium to grow freely and unreservedly throughout the whole country, and that would mean the demoralisation of the whole of India as the people would at once largely grow it for their own domestic consumption. We have heard a good deal about opium absorbing fine land that might otherwise be used to good purposes. The fact is that this land is used for good purposes, as a crop of rice is invariably taken off the land before the opium crop is gathered, therefore the land does grow other things as well as opium. I think that those who have argued this question have not sufficiently considered it. What is the opium grown in India according to population? Habitual consumers of opium might use ten parts of an ounce a day, but there is not enough opium grown in the country to demoralise so vast a popnlalation. What is the case with China? Sir Robert Hart told us that only one per cent. of the population of China smoked opium, and even if India imports ten times as much as she grows the total supply would only account for ten per cent. of the population. I leave the political aspects of the case because those I am not so well qualified to discuss; but I think I am entitled to say a word about the medical aspects of opium because my labours in medicine have been devoted to the consideration of drugs and their properties, and I have taken the opportunity of getting the best assistance I could and consulting the best authorities as to the effects of opium. One difficulty about the consideration of this question is that I think, when many persons who talk about the use of Indian opium, fancy they are getting the same thing as the Turkish drug from Smyrna. We know very well that the Indian drug is of such weak effect that it is never used in medicine in this country; there is no market for it. If you restrict the growth of opium in India you could get no revenue at all, for the drug is too weak to be of any benefit in medicine, and when opium is used for smoking it is used as an extract. It is mixed with a number of other drugs which have the same relation to opium that a glass of whiskey toddy would bear to the spirit which was previously put into the glass. I do not know if any hon. member has ever seen a person smoking opium. The quantity he uses is extremely small—a piece no larger than the tip of the finger is put into the pipe, the smoker takes one or two whiffs, enough to give him a pleasurable feeling and send him into a comfortable sleep. Very often the smoker, having for a time forgotten his troubles, rouses up again very little the worse for his indulgence. Whiskey and opium are very much alike in their double action. Small doses are stimulative and restorative but large doses are narcotic. It is in small doses for its stimulating effect that opium is taken; and there is a great difference between eating opium and smoking it—just the difference there is between chewing and smoking tobacco. If you chew tobacco you get a greater amount of the narcotic injurious principle into the system than you do if you smoke it, and it is the same with opium. Medical authorities have held that morphia, which is the active principle of opium, is not volatilized by heat at all, so that the smoke when carried into the lungs does not carry with it any of the active principle. I am sure the hon. member for the Ilkestone

division (Sir W. Foster)—who seems to have been deserted by his medical colleagues, and who, therefore, has not the benefit of their advice on this matter—will confirm me in what I say about the medical aspects of the case. He cannot help doing it. The political aspect of the case is a totally different thing. The physical vigour of people who eat opium has been disparaged. I know nothing about the Chinese, but I have travelled in Rajputana, and I am bound to say a finer, more manly, vigourous, and splendid set of people I never met. We are also told of the terrible evils of opium eating in Burma, but a more charming people I never saw in my life than the Burmese. I go further, and am prepared to say that opium in small doses, as a tonic or restorative, is of considerable value in preventing ague. My hon. friend who proposed this motion said he could not believe that any persons could take opium with advantage. Let me mention a circumstance which came under my own observation. I was dining with a poor friend of mine, a man who was in consumption. He got through the early part of the dinner very well, but began to flag about the middle. He went out and when he returned, he said to me, "Do you know what I went away for? I went away to give myself a subcutaneous injection of morphia." When he came back he was cheerful, and was stimulated in a way I am sure no small dose of alcohol or a tonic could have stimulated him. I have not the least hesitation in saying that a moderate use of this stimulant preserved that poor man's life certainly for a year or two. I was very much surprised to hear from the hon. baronet who introduced the motion that opium was a worse evil than alcohol. I certainly admit with the hon. baronet that the opium smoker, lying in a state of quiet, dreamy satisfaction, is quite useless, but he is not absolutely mischievous. He does not get up and beat his wife or kick her to death with his heavy boots. There is no crime that I am aware of specially connected with the use of opium, I should like to say most strongly that opium does not cause any of that destruction of tissue which alcohol does, and therefore, however much a man may suffer from the great evil of the excessive use of opium, there is still hope for him if he pulls up at last in his mischievous course. The same cannot be said of the alcohol drinker. If he amends he finds himself in a much worse physical condition than he was before he began to drink excessively. His liver and kidneys are crumpled and shrivelled, his heart is wrong, the tissue of his body has physically degenerated, and he dies a victim of the secondary results of that degeneration. I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I have shown the House that even the worst and most hopeless opium-eater may return to health. Some time ago I heard of the case of an old woman living in a low district who died at the age of ninety, and who had been in the habit of taking some two or three hundred ounces of opium per diem. (Laughter.) Of course I mean grains. Yet she carried on a laborious life, and died in the full odour of sanctity at the age of ninety years. And now I conclude. I have tried to prove that as regards the Indian trade the Chinese are practically in the position of local option, they can prohibit the introduction of the drug; that the evil effects of opium have been enormously exaggerated; and thirdly that the abandonment of the revenue derived from this source would make India bankrupt. Some part of the case of course depends on official evidence, and there are some people who think that official statements must necessarily be tainted. I have read statements to that effect, but I do not believe that an English gentleman drops all his veracity at his office door, and we are, in my opinion, bound to accept these statements from high-minded eminent officers who rule with honour and distinction various foreign lands under our sway. I think, too, that the mover and seconder of this resolution may take some comfort from the belief that in thirty or forty years matters will come round to the way they would wish, and the Chinese will grow all their own opium and want none from India, and thus there will come a natural end to a condition of things we deplore, but which I think is not so bad as has been represented.

The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson, Bart., Manchester, N.E.): I believe the House will expect from me some statement in answer to strong appeals addressed to the Government by honourable members, although I very much regret that the task has fallen to me instead of to my right hon. friend the Under Secretary for India (Sir John Gorst) to make that reply. Still I think I shall be able to satisfy the House that the Government of India is not bent upon demoralising the people of India and China by carrying on the opium trade, that all possible efforts are made to control and curtail this traffic with a view to restrain the consumption of the drug among their own subjects in India, and towards a gradual reduction of the export to China. Now, the hon. baronet, the member for the Barnard Castle division, does not now for the first or second time raise this question, and no one can doubt the entire earnestness and sincerity with which he has taken up this question. His sole wish is to remove what he thinks is a blot upon our national character and to stop what he considers is a source of great mischief to all the people concerned. I entirely recognise his honourable object and his disinterested efforts to accomplish it, and if I demur at all to his statements of facts and point out the impracticability of the changes he proposes to introduce, I can assure him that in doing so I in no way depreciate his motives or doubt the nobility of the object he has at heart. It is quite true, as he has said, that there is among the public a growing interest in this question. I know that the public mind is more stirred in relation to this matter than I ever remember it to have been in former years; but I also think that, to a large extent, an artificial interest has been created, and the public mind has been influenced by many impassioned appeals that are not quite consistent with the real facts of the case. I judge this from many statements I have read and from a great many letters which have appeared in the public press. Into these I will not enter at any length; but the House will remember that there is one allegation constantly made that we force our Indian opium on the Chinese. Now that is not the fact, and the statement has been disproved over and over again. In former debates it has been shown that in negotiating the treaty of Tientsin, Lord Elgin expressly disclaimed to his secretary, who conducted the negotiations, any intention of requiring the Chinese to reserve Indian opium. It was entirely because the Chinese Ministers considered that they could not dispense with it, that opium was an article included in the tariff. ("No, No!") If that is doubted I can prove my statement from the despatch from the Government of India presented to Parliament in 1882. In this dispatch to the Secretary of State there is included a statement from Mr. Lay, the Chinese Secretary to Lord Elgin's Mission. All the negotiations, he says, "at Tientsin passed through me. Not one word upon either side was ever said about opium from first to last. The revision of the tariff and the adjustment of all questions affecting our trade were designedly left for after deliberation and arrangement; and it was agreed that for that purpose the Chinese High Commissioner should meet Lord Elgin at Shanghai in the following winter." In the meantime, Mr. Lay continues, "the preparation of the tariff devolved upon me at the desire of the Chinese, no less than Lord Elgin. When I came to 'opium' I inquired what course they proposed to take in respect to it. The answer was, 'We have resolved to put it into the tariff as *Yang Yoh'* (Foreign Medicine). I urged a moderate duty in view of the cost of collection, which was agreed to. This represents, with strict accuracy, the amount of 'extortion resorted to.'" From that time to this it has rested on that footing. The Chinese at any time may terminate the treaty on giving twelve months' notice, or to protect themselves they may increase the duty to any extent they please, or they may exclude it altogether. Thus, I think I may say, that if the Chinese Government thought proper to raise the duty to a prohibitive extent or shut out the article altogether this country would not expend a pound in powder and shot, or lose the life of a soldier in an attempt to force the opium upon the Chinese. I deny that our wars with China were on account of opium. Our quarrels with the Chinese were on account of trade generally, opium was only one item and war was carried on in order to open China to trade generally, not for the trade in opium. The hon. baronet condemns the practice of the Indian Government in respect to opium entirely, and in this he differs from the line taken on former occasions by which he regarded the system founded in Western India in respect to the levying of duty on opium as comparatively unobjectionable. I am not concerned to weigh the different degrees of morality of the two systems. The cultivation is limited in Bengal to certain areas, the poppy is grown under license, the produce is taken at fixed rate, paid for handsomely, and sold at public auction. In Western India the poppy is grown in independent States, and by treaty opium is sent through the Custom House. What we have to consider is this. Whichever way we deal with this business it is in the same spirit, on the same principle, that the Indian Government deals with the spirit duty in this country. There are three ways of dealing with the trade in intoxicants and narcotics, things which may be harmless or even beneficial taken in small quantities, but extremely injurious to human health and life if taken in excess. You can either forbid the trade altogether, you can tolerate it and not interfere with it, or you can regulate the trade. The course taken alike in this country and in India is to regulate the trade, to place upon these things the highest duty possible for them to bear without offering too great a temptation to smuggling. There is practically no difference between the system pursued in this country and in India, nor in principle any difference in the method pursued in dealing with opium in Bengal and in Bombay. I wish to point out further, for the matter might be mistaken from what has been said in speeches by the hon. baronet and my hon. friend behind me, that in some States such as the great Mahratta States, by treaty sufficient opium is grown for home consumption and none for export. My hon. friend is mistaken when he talks of the amount grown in Rajputana. In a great part the poppy is not grown at all, and in other parts under treaty they grow the poppy on condition of being supplied with Malwa opium free of duty for their own consumption. But there were one or two things said by the hon. baronet in his speech to which I must refer and respect, for the serious nature of his speech requires that I should give attention to it. Suppose, said the hon. baronet, the Government of the country had the whiskey trade in its hands, that would be the Gothenburg system which some people advocate. I should not like the State here or in India to undertake the sale and distribution of an article of the kind. It would have some considerations to recommend it, but there would be I think greater objections. For one thing it would tend to demoralise the public service. The hon. baronet has referred to an opinion expressed by Sir Thomas Wade, and I must admit that in relation to matters connected with Chinese trade, this is an authority of the highest importance. If Sir Thomas Wade unreservedly condemned our position towards China that opinion is deserving of every consideration and respect. But let me remind the hon. baronet of a passage in the papers laid before Parliament in 1882, quoted from a despatch, from Sir Thomas Wade to the Secretary of State in 1881. Sir Thomas Wade gives an account of a conversation he held with the Chinese Ministers. "I went" he says, "to Yamen, to speak on various matters. Four members received me. Adverting to opium I observed that the authorities in some places were taxing opium, native and foreign; in others, were trying to increase the sale and consumption of both. Without at all denying the right of the Chinese Government to do as it chose, I should wish to know what course the Government approved? They said the question was embarrassing. The Chinese Government would be glad to stop opium smoking altogether, but the habit was too confirmed to be stopped by official intervention. No idea of abolishing the trade at present was in the mind of the Government. Alluding to the desire of well disposed people at home to see England withdrawn from the trade, I asked if it would be of any use to diminish yearly the export from India. The Indian Government might be thus enabled to provide otherwise for loss of income. They said, so long as the habit exists, opium will be procured either from India or elsewhere. Any serious attempt to check the evil must

originate with the people themselves. The measure I suggest would affect Chinese revenue, but would not reach the root of the mischief." Now, it has been said by the hon. baronet to-night, as it has been said before, that we introduced opium into China. No greater mistake was ever made. We did not introduce it.

Sir J. PEASE: The right hon. gentleman will allow me to say that I never said so in my life.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON: I beg pardon, the hon. baronet said I think that we had set the Chinese to grow opium.

Sir J. PEASE: Yes.

Sir J. FERGUSSON: Very well. Now, as bearing upon that, I may be allowed to say that Sir Thomas Wade told me to-day there is good reason to suppose that opium has been grown in China from time immemorial. In 1840, when the first treaty was made, opium was grown 3,000 miles from the seaboard in the most remote parts of China, and equal to that grown in India. Clearly then we did not introduce the drug into China though that statement has been made, though not by the hon. baronet. It was an article of trade in the days of Queen Elizabeth in what are now known as the Straits Settlements. The use of opium, like the use of spirits, has been the habit of people in parts of India from time immemorial. In the very early history of our occupation our officers seriously contemplated the cutting down of palia trees to prevent the distillation of ardent spirits. No one could respect more than I do the expression of opinion by Christian and benevolent Societies on this subject. They no doubt feel strongly that we should not by our policy inflict injury on the people of India or China. But while there is the strong demand, the great desire of people, for this drug, it is impossible to prevent its use without an exercise of force amounting to downright tyranny. As has been said by the hon. member opposite (Dr. Farquharson), the moderate use of the drug is very common, and I am reminded of my own experience in India. Among the Rajputs it is the universal practice to offer a drink of a solution of opium as a mark of hospitality; it is used as a sort of stirrup cup, a bowl being specially kept for the purpose of dissolving the opium in water. No one can say that it has had a demoralising and degrading effect upon the Rajputs; there is no finer race of men in India. A warlike, manly, energetic race they are, and yet they are in the habit of taking this as a drink in the morning just as a man in England may smoke his pipe. It is quite true that one of the articles of impeachment against Warren Hastings was the sending of opium into China, but that is by no means any proof that Warren Hastings was among the first to send opium from India to China. It may be that the work of the missionaries is prejudiced by Europeans taking part in the opium trade, but if there was not a single chest of opium sent from India to China there would be a great falling-off of Indian revenue; yet there would be little diminution in the quantity used in China, because year by year the native grown opium would increase, displacing the Indian opium, which, under a high import duty, is an expensive luxury. There is evidence that the Chinese grown opium will displace the Indian imports. The low excise duty put upon it by the Chinese Government gives it a ready sale and promises at no distant period to displace the Indian opium. The fact is there is in China, as elsewhere, several phases of opinion. There are those who disapprove of its use altogether, but there is also a large class interested in the cultivation, who think it ought to be promoted rather than discouraged. Burma has been mentioned to-night, and there is some confusion between the negotiations in British or Lower Burma and the recently annexed province of Upper Burma. In Lower Burma the sale of opium is strictly regulated; there are only twenty licensed shops, and that the regulations are enforced is proved by the fact that last year 300 persons were prosecuted in Akbar for the illicit sale of opium. The shops are not kept by Bengalese but by Chinese, for there is a large Chinese population, and the sale could not be prohibited without causing great excitement. In Upper Burma, on the other hand, the sale and use of opium was prohibited by former kings through the influence of the priests, but as a matter of fact the drug was commonly sold and used. According to the reports of officers, with which at this late hour I will not trouble the House, the Government have set about checking this illicit sale, but they allow a limited number of shops for the natives of China and India who are accustomed to the use of the drug, but neither opium nor spirits are to be sold to native Burmese. And yet it is made a reproach against the Government of India. You cannot govern a country upon abstract principles; you must deal with the country as it is. People have a certain habit which you may discourage to some extent, and to some extent you may suppress it by making indulgence in the habit expensive. Finally, I come to the position the Government take on this question. It has been often before the House, and whichever party has been in office the Government have recognised the evils that do attend on an excessive rise of opium. The difficulties in regard to India have been often urged. The hon. member opposite said just now that India would be bankrupt if an end were put to opium revenue. That is an extravagant statement. The gross receipts from opium estimated for the present year, were about Rx. 8,300,000, and the net revenue Rx. 5,300,000. There is not only to be considered the revenue which India derives and which she will have to make up; but there is also the profit of the cultivator, and the interests of all concerned cannot be disregarded in a proposal to sweep away the trade. You may withdraw a source of revenue, you may gradually wean the people to other industries, but you cannot with a high hand take away the means by which they live and which they have been pursuing with perfect obedience to law for years past. In comparison with our own revenue the amount which India derives from the opium trade may not seem a very large sum, but I would ask the House to remember that it is a fifth part of the gross revenue of India received from taxation, and that surely is no small amount. In the next place I would ask the House how they could propose to replace such an item in the receipts of the Government of India? It is well-known it is very difficult to find a new item of taxation in India without seriously hurting the prosperity and comfort of the people. We have in recent years made many efforts for the defence of India; we are frequently called upon to do more in the way of work for developing the means of communication. The other day we were asked to reduce the salt tax. How can you hope to reduce the salt tax which is so profitable, if you are to deprive the Government of more than five millions? It is manifest that the postponement of the reduction of this tax as one of the necessaries of life must be for an indefinite time. The hon. baronet spoke of the sum as three and a half millions sterling, but the rupee goes as far in India as ever, notwithstanding the difference in Exchange. You have to provide for the item in the Indian currency, and not in the British. How are you going to deal with the native States, to whom you have granted this revenue, because they will not be content to go without the profits they derived from the trade. It is evident it would disturb your relations with them, and that the amount that would have to be made up would not be confined to the loss of revenues to India or even to the compensation of those who obtained a livelihood from the trade. These are very serious considerations. I freely admit that the Government of India have never denied that it would be very desirable that this source of revenue should be altered. They have taken means to reduce it; they have diminished the number of licenses, and they have diminished the area on which the poppy was grown. 100,000 acres less are now under poppy in Bengal than ten years ago. I read to the House yesterday some statistics in regard to opium in the last ten years, which show that from 1881 to the present time the diminution in the total consumption in British India has been from 5,606 chests to 4,500 chests, a diminution of above thirty per cent., which I think shows that the measures of the Government have not been without effect. The change cannot be made suddenly, but it is being already made by degrees. The revenue of India I am glad to say has increased in the last five years by seven millions sterling. I hope the works of development going on will cause it to increase still more so, that little by little this revenue, which is objectionable in many ways, because it is the result of over indulgence, no doubt will gradually be diminished. Before I sit down I will notice what was said by the hon member for Kirkcudbright as to the system in the Eastern provinces, particularly in Singapore and Hong Kong, where opium licenses are farmed out, which probably furnishes too great an inducement and encouragement for the sale of the drug. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has, I know, expressed his dislike to the farming system, and he will call upon Colonial Governments to consider the practicability of substituting another system, and by fixing the price of the licences as highly as possible thereby reduce the number. I think I have shown the House that the Government do desire to limit, and obstruct, and regulate this traffic. It is impossible to abolish it straight away without great hardship to the Indian people, unless, indeed, this House shall make good the loss. I remember not many years ago, the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian express an opinion to that effect. Not only would you take away from India this profitable revenue derived from a common source, but you impose upon India the necessity of making up that revenue by taxing still more highly those people who, some hon. gentlemen opposite say, are now overtaxed. Therefore, I think I may say this motion should not be pressed as a vote of censure on the Government of India, seeing that their policy is tending in the direction which hon. members desire to go, though it is impossible at one stroke to accomplish the object they have at heart.

Mr. S. SMITH (Flintshire): I think the House will agree with me that the speech to which we have just listened is a very fair one, coming from a Government official representing on this occasion the Government of India. I have to thank the right hon. gentleman for the tone of his speech, for the courtesy with which he has treated our views, and for certain important concessions he has made. For instance, he made a concession that never has been publicly made in this Parliament, and which will be fruitful of very important consequences. He has told us, speaking on behalf of the Government, that we will never again fire a shot in China in order to insist upon their receiving opium. I wish to fix the Government to this most important concession, and I hope it will be known throughout China and throughout all Asia, to-morrow, that the British Government has practically repented of the policy pursued towards China for the last hundred years. I am bound now to ask the House to permit me, for a few moments, to criticise some of the statements of my right hon. friend. I am sorry that we who are moving in this matter have to join issue absolutely with him on some statements which he puts forth officially on this occasion. The main statement which he made, which is always made in these opium debates, is that this country has never forced opium upon China; I think that is a very startling statement to make in face of all the evidence that we have upon the subject. The right hon. gentleman has referred to the opinions of Sir Thomas Wade, the British Ambassador at Pekin, whom we have heard justly styled to be a man of great eminence, and whose opinion is entitled to the greatest weight. I am willing to leave the whole decision of this question to the reported opinions of Sir Thomas Wade, and I hope the House will give me their attention for two or three minutes while I lay before them the opinions of our highly respected ambassador in China. We were told we used no compulsion under the Treaty of Tientsin: I think Sir Thomas was in China when that Treaty was agreed to. Here is what he wrote in 1868, in a despatch to the British Government: "We are generally prone to forget that the footing we have in China has been obtained by force, and by force alone, and that unwarlike and unenergetic as we hold the Chinese to be, it is in reality to the fear of force alone that we are indebted for the safety we enjoy at certain points accessible to our force. Yet nothing that has been gained, it must be remembered, was received from the free will of the Chinese; more, the concessions made to us from time to time, have been from first to last extorted against the conscience of the nation, in defiance, that is to say, of the moral convictions of its educated men, not merely of the office-holders whom we call mandarins, and who are numerically but a small proportion of the educated class, but of the millions who are saturated with a knowledge of the history and philosophy of their country. To these as a rule the very extension of our trade must appear politically, or what is in China the same thing morally, wrong, and the story of foreign intercourse, during the last thirty years, can have no effect but to confirm them in their opinion." Does the Under

Secretary agree with that opinion, that we have extorted everything from China by force, that our action in China has always been contrary to the moral convictions of the country?

Sir J. FERGUSSON: No doubt the introduction of the opium trade was unwholesome to the Chinese. What I said was that in no sense was opium forced upon them.

Mr. S. SMITH: Very well, I will try again. Here is what Sir Thomas Wade stated in 1869. He reported to the Government that he had been complaining to the Chinese Government of their hostility to the trade, and here is the reply which he passed on to the British Government. "The Chinese minister said how irreparable and continuous was the injury which they saw inflicted upon the whole empire by the foreign importation of opium. If England would consent to interdict this, cease either to grow it in India or to allow their ships to bring it to China, there might be some hope of more friendly feelings. They believed the extension of this pernicious habit was mainly due to the alacrity with which foreigners supplied the poison for their own profit, perfectly regardless of the irreparable injury inflicted, and naturally they felt hostile to all concerned in such a traffic." That was the reason which the Chinese Government gave, and rightly gave for their hostility. It is too late in the day now to be told that this country did not force opium upon China. The judgment of history has been passed upon it, and no historian of repute now would deny that our first war was entirely an opium war, brought on by smuggling opium into China for fifty years, by defying the Chinese edicts constantly issued against it; and by forcing this opium upon them by traders we at last brought on that deplorable war. The second war was at bottom and substantially another opium war, brought on by continuing this smuggling throughout, in defiance of all the edicts of the Chinese Government. I say we gained entrance into China for opium purely by force, contrary to the convictions of the people. Until we obtained entrance for it, opium was prohibited in China, the Chinese Government used its whole power to suppress the growth of opium at home, but at last it found by our efforts that it was vain to struggle against it. Now I will pass to one or two other statements which the right hon. gentleman has made to us regarding India. He tells us that the policy of the Government of India has been to regulate and to control the traffic in opium and that if they had endeavoured to do more than that it would be considered an intolerable hardship by the people. Now, I deny that. I say the best proof of it is to leave it to the people themselves, to local option. Leave any town in India to decide by the voice of the people whether they wish opium shops open or not, and I do not believe you will find a single place in India that will not, by a unanimous vote, decide to close the opium shops. I do not believe there is one State in India that will not agree to the closing of these shops if put to the popular vote. All the native States that are free and independent have prohibited opium. The Burmese Government made it a capital offence to sell opium or to smoke it; but as soon as we got possession of Burma what did we do? We spread the taste by the free distribution of opium cases among the young people. We gradually developed the habit that was unknown before, in the most abominable manner; and over large tracts of that country we have brought misery and ruin in our steps. I consider our dealing with Burma in this whole question of opium disgraceful in the last degree. We have published false statistics on the subject, we have deluded the people of this country by putting forth the statement that we have only licensed thirty-four opium shops in Burma, whereas the fact is that these opium shops are distributing centres to a vast number of small towns. One gentleman in a single town counted fifty opium dens in three-quarters of an hour. Yet our Government says there is only one licensed shop there. It is believed there are thousands. And so all over Burma. I say we are thoroughly humbugged and thoroughly deceived by official statistics put forward regarding opium in India and China. Now we have been told there is a great decrease in the consumption in India. I am sorry to say I do not believe it. All the information accessible to me points in the opposite direction, and I must give the House some figures taken from the last excise reports of the Government of India. I ask the House whether they agree with the statement that the consumption of opium is declining in India. In the Presidency of Bombay the number of opium shops licensed was 652, and here are the revenue returns: For the five years ending 1882 the revenue was 51,000 rupees, for the five years ending 1887, 97,000 rupees. In 1888, 118,000 rupees. In 1889, 120,000 rupees; for 1890, 121,000 rupees; and the estimate for 1891 is 129,000 rupees; showing in the Bombay Presidency alone an increase of just 150 per cent. in ten years. I commend that fact to the attention of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Well, take Bengal. Here are the figures for 1887 and 1888, the latest years we have got. They were Rs.4,137,000 in 1887, and Rs.4,399,000 in 1888, an increase of 262,000 rupees. The increase for five years was 842,000 rupees. That does not look like a decrease. Here are the last figures I shall trouble the House with. They are for Lower Burma. In 1888 17 lakhs of rupees; in 1889, there were 18 lakhs of rupees. That is an increase of 8½ per cent. In Arakan the revenue from opium in 1886 was 71,000 rupees, in 1887, 119,000 rupees, in 1888, 176,000, in 1889, 188,000, and last year, 158,000. Now I am very much afraid that we are being deceived or misled by the Government statistics. It was my duty some years ago to analyse the Abkari statistics with regard to the liquor traffic, and I came to the conclusion that they were altogether untrustworthy, and I am very much afraid it is the same with the opium traffic. The fact is that the demand in India for revenue is so enormous and overwhelming that it leads to evasions, it leads to official colouring whenever desirable, rather than allow the real facts to transpire. It is virtually impossible to get thoroughly straightforward returns in a question of this kind. I think everyone who has had experience of Indian statistics will justify what I am saying. I freely admit that India is a very poor country, and that it is quite impossible for us to throw extra taxation upon India to the extent of four millions sterling. What we have to face is this. India will lose four millions sterling of money by the abolition of the opium traffic. It is clear to me that if this country is to force upon India, as it ought to do, the abolition of this traffic, this country must come to its assistance. I am quite sure that if the case were put straight and plain before the people of this country, if it was made clear that a great national sin had to be expiated, and that the cost was to be four millions, there would be no difficulty in finding the money. The amount is a trifle in comparison with the amount of the wealth of this country. Our annual income is about 1,230 millions a year. Mr. Giffen puts the capital at ten thousand millions sterling. I therefore ask, would there be any difficulty in getting three or four millions a year? It is absurd to say that there would be any difficulty. If the conscience of this country were roused, it would be looked upon as a fleabite, and it would be far easier for us to do work of this kind now, than to pay twenty millions for the abolition of the slave trade in 1830. England was then very poor, but she is rich now. Her income is three or four times as large, and her taxation is very much lighter. There would be no difficulty, whatever, out of the surpluses we have year after year in the Budget, to find the little amount required to tide India over her difficulties in the very few years for which it would be requisite. Of this I feel perfectly certain that the sacrifice this country would make would ennoble her and raise her in the esteem of every nation in the earth. The advantages that would come back to us would repay us tenfold for all the little sacrifice we have to make. We should have an immense development of the trade with China, as an hon. friend observes. Our trade with China has been starved, and that by this wretched policy. It has remained absolutely stationary for many years. I believe that Lancashire alone has paid in the loss of trade more than the whole amount that would be required to extinguish the opium traffic. How ever we look at this matter—whether we look at it from the point of view of political economy, from the point of view of Christianity, from the point of view of ethics—I believe our bounden duty is to take measures for the early extinction of the trade. I believe the country will soon demand it. I do not think the Government know how strong the feeling is in the country, and they may yet discover it in a surprising manner. At the next general election any candidate who comes before an audience and says we should make a little sacrifice to put an end to the iniquity will carry his audience with him. I do not believe a single constituency will return a member who would support the present system, and no candidate will make a speech such as that made to-night by the hon. member for Aberdeenshire without being hissed off the platform; at all events, he would receive manifest tokens of disapprobation. The only point I can compliment the hon. member upon is his courage. A more violent and a more extraordinary speech was never listened to in this House; and I venture to say no man will at the next general election face an audience with such a speech and be returned holding such views. I hope the House will do itself honour to-night. It has a great chance. I hope we shall have a division to-night that shall do honour to this House, and that shall raise this country in the estimation of foreign countries, and save us from that national judgment which will certainly come upon us some day if we persist in this national sin.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcestershire, Evesham): Sir, at this late hour, owing to my official experience of all parts of this great question, I may perhaps crave permission of the House to summarise in a very few moments the practical morality of this question. Sir, with all honour to the hon. baronet, the mover of this resolution, and the striking, perhaps stirring, testimony which he produced, the House will recollect that the hon. member belongs to a very honourable party, the temperance party, and we know that precisely the same testimony, only stronger and larger, could be adduced by any temperance speaker regarding the use of alcoholic spirits in this country. Now, sir, the hon. baronet says that the opium system of India and China is morally indefensible. I say it is defensible. If it were indefensible, I would not undertake to defend it. If it be morally justifiable, then and then only would I undertake its defence. I make no *ad miserecordiam* appeal. If the thing be wrong, then I do not claim the money: I would let it go, be the consequences what they may, be the embarrassment to the Government of India, be the consequent taxation to the people of India, what they may. But, sir, I undertake to show that upon moral grounds, upon grounds of practical morality, that the system is just as defensible as the excise system of this country, or of any civilised country in Europe. Of the opium supplied to China, three-fourths is produced in that country. That is of inferior quality and is increasing and is subject to only one kind of taxation, namely, the local one. That taxation goes to the Chinese Government. One-fourth of the opium comes from India. That is of a superior kind, is fast decreasing, is subject to double taxation—first, that by the Government of China, an import duty, and, secondly, the duty levied by the Government of India. So that on the whole the question of Indian opium in China is what the champagne of France is to the rest of the wines of that country. Then China is perfectly free. I will not go into those questions of ancient history which have, to the undue occupation of the time of this House, been adduced by the hon. member who has just sat down. But how is the case at this moment? There has been a Convention lasting for a few years only, according to which Indian opium was admitted to China upon the condition that the Chinese Government were to levy only a limited amount of taxation. The term of that Convention has expired, and the Chinese Government might put prohibitory duties upon, or might stop, the Indian opium trade altogether. Indian opium lies at their mercy. Therefore China is entirely a free agent. Now the House will see that if China is poisoned, she poisons herself. As to whether this opium poisons, the House has just heard the important medical testimony given by the hon. member for Aberdeen. But there is still more important evidence, namely, that of my hon. friend the member for Hackney, and I only hope that time will permit of his giving us his opinion. To the best of my knowledge and judgment opium is not deleterious, and is far less deleterious than alcoholic drink. Either taken to excess is harmful, but the former less than the latter. It is not the case that opium leads to crime. Of course, excessive use of it will directly lead to various social mischiefs which may amount to crime, but leading to crime in the same sense as when spirits are taken to excess, is not a consequence of the indulgence in opium. The hon. baronet spoke of

opium being labelled in this country as a poison. Why, certainly, that is the concentrated distillation, amounting to a tincture. That is poison. But that is a wholly different thing to the substance sold in the Eastern bazaars under the name of opium. That opium is perfectly harmless if taken in moderation, and it is taken by many classes in Western India without any mischief whatever or without anybody being acquainted with the fact that it is taken at all. We have heard evidence to-night that it is taken by the most stalwart and enduring troops of Western India and of Eastern India. It is a fact that the inhabitants of Assam and that region, being opium and not drink consumers, as in other parts of India, are about the most quiet population. It is not really the fact that opium is a poison in the true sense of the word. Like spirits it may be taken in excess, and unlike spirits, it is not so dangerous. Well, the question arises, Are the Chinese poisoned? To what extent do the people of China consume opium? Only to the most limited. Why sir, it has been shown upon a piece of testimony of the very highest authority in China, that not more than one man out of one hundred and fifty obtains access to opium at all. Now, the hon. baronet spoke of the thousands and masses of people who are being poisoned. What is the truth? Are the people of China in a degraded state? Quite the contrary. Their numbers are increasing, their trade is expanding, their industry is great. So much are they over-populating the vast and magnificent area with which Providence has endowed them, that they are obliged to emigrate to foreign places. They people Lower Burma, the Malay Peninsula, Java, and other Islands, and if it had not been for the action of our white countrymen they would have obtained a large share in the Australian Continent, and if it were not for the Americans they would hold the Eastern coast of the Pacific. They are not the sort of people who are poisoned, and who are being demoralised. I charge the hon. baronet, and those who think with him with unintentional, nevertheless, monstrous, exaggeration. Then, consider what is really our position in India. What do we do to this opium produced in India? We put a very heavy tax indeed upon it—three or four times *ad valorem*, the cost of production. I say that we have a right to do so, just as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has a right to tax whiskey in Scotland and Ireland. I say there is no harm whatever in taxing a spirit, or in taxing a drug. Either is harmless when used in moderation; then it is beneficial; it is dangerous only when used to excess; but the possibility of its being used to excess has never been treated as an argument against the method of taxation, either here or in any civilised country of Europe. You say that we not only act as growers of it, but that we trade in it. I may say with regard to the trad of Calcutta and Bombay that there are Armenians, Greeks, and merchants of other nationalities, men of wealth, energy, and enterprise, who would be very much astonished to hear that their steamers, wharves, and various apparatus of trade are part of a Government concern. It is said, why raise revenue from an unholy traffic? Does not the House perceive that the same thing might be said of spirits, from which we annually derive a vast revenue. Why this argument as regards opium runs on all fours from top to bottom, *pari passu*, and is in every respect similar to, the argument with regard to the taxation of alcoholic liquors in every civilized country of Europe. Upon this point, I listened with great interest to the confession of Coleridge which the hon. baronet read. Does he not see that if Coleridge had taken spirits instead of opium, and had suffered from *delirium tremens*, instead of the narcotic effects of opium, his confession would have been ten times graver than that which has been read. It was very lucky, living in this country, he took to opium and not to spirits. The hon. baronet, my hon. friend (Mr. M. Stewart), and the hon. member (Mr. S. Smith), have attempted to set up for China, and for India, a standard which they cannot and dare not set up in this country. I appeal to them to take the beam out of our own national eye before looking to the mote in the eye of our fellow creatures in India and China. Before I conclude, just a few words regarding our own system in India itself. With regard to Malwa, we levy a heavy export duty, but the case is different as to Bengal. There, undoubtedly, we have a different system; still our system of excise here is not in any respect so strict as our system in India in the matter of opium. No man can indulge in the production of this drug without a license. Everything has to be done on the spot where it can be under the inspection of the Government officers. And why is this? It is because we wish to make sure that the traffic in this article does not spread amongst our own people, and see that it goes to Calcutta, from which place it is exported to China. It is for these purposes that this system of excise regulations and of licensing cultivation and Government inspection is adopted in Bengal. Nothing would be easier, if you wished it, than to adopt in Bengal the same system which prevails in Western India, so that the drug might be manufactured under Government inspection. If, however, you adopt the recommendation of the hon. baronet opposite, there are strong grounds for the fear that all the evils attending the traffic of the drug which are now absent from our Indian population would spring up. We are anxious that the people there should not consume this drug, and it is because we are anxious for the moral welfare of our Indian people that the system I have described to the House is carried out. A great deal of misapprehension exists is the minds of those who denounce this system, and a good deal of misrepresentation has been indulged in although, no doubt, unintentionally; but it is because of this misapprehension and misrepresentation that it is necessary that this point should be cleared up. Let me ask the House what will be the consequence of attempting to abolish altogether the traffic in this drug. We should stop the exportation of the Malwa native States opium, and the result will be that all along the whole course of our frontiers there would be a vast increase in the illicit traffic in opium and in the consumption of that article. That would be one of the first results of our carrying the motion of the hon. baronet to-night. If you were thus to abolish all interference in the matters in connection with the opium question, fresh legislation would very soon be required. But I do not think you would get the legislature of India to agree to the passing of such a law. Opium is a thing which can be grown in every man's back garden, and if the cultivation of it cannot be conducted openly and honestly, would not the prohibition lead to great evil? Besides, when you have prohibited its cultivation and stopped its regular transit through British territory, what will you have done? You will have destroyed five and-a-half millions of British revenue, and, by enabling the people to obtain opium untaxed and therefore cheaper, you will have stimulated the consumption of the drug instead of checking it as taxation necessarily has that tendency to do. In this way you will have created the very opposite effect to that which is intended. Such would be the result of the ill-advised proposal now before the House should the House think fit to adopt it. I am thankful to the House for the kind attention with which it has listened to me to-night, and I will not attempt to detain it much longer; but although I have spoken at some length I have offered a mere summary of what might have been said on this important question, because every one of the propositions I have put before the House would require at least a quarter of an hour to properly state it. I should, however, like to add a few words with regard to what has been said about Burma. It is quite absurd to speak about opium as being prohibited in Burma. Why, sir, consumption of opium has flourished in Burma for a long period. I may say it has been going on in that country merrily, and it is only since the effects of its extensive consumption there has been brought to our notice that the system has been brought under a strict excise supervision. With regard to India I do not propose to enter into any statistical discussion with my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Mark Stewart). I may say, however, that in some respects, India may be regarded as a moral country. The consumption of alcohol among the Indian people is so small that I believe it does not apply to more than five or six per cent. of the population in certain parts of the country, while in others it is much less. I think I am within the mark when I say that not more than four per cent. of the whole of that large population of 260,000,000 ever indulge in the consumption of alcoholic or narcotic substances. This, I think, is a result of which we may well be proud, and considering the magnificence of such an administrative fact I can bear with great equanimity all the detailed criticism which, with the best possible intentions, has been poured upon me by my hon. friend (Mr. M. Stewart). I have only to say, in conclusion, that if we are to sacrifice five and a half millions of our revenue by adopting the motion of the hon. baronet we must be prepared to do so at the expense of the material improvements we are now enabled to carry on in India, and we shall find that we are only putting that enormous sum into the pockets of the opium consumers of China without any commensurate result, either moral or physical. I trust, therefore, that this House will, by a decisive majority, reject the motion of the hon. baronet which will only lead to the perpetuation of the very evil which the hon. baronet vainly hopes to cure.

Mr. MACDONALD CAMERON (Wick): I cannot but thank the hon. baronet behind me for the manner in which he has brought this Resolution before the House, although I very much regret that the data on which we have to consider this matter is not so complete as it might have been. I may say that I had put down an amendment which I submitted to you, sir, for your consideration, but which you felt it necessary to rule was out of order. That amendment had for its object the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole system of the opium traffic in order that the House might have authentic data on which to found something like sound legislation. A good deal of sentiment—in fact, a great deal too much sentiment—has entered into some of the legislation passed by this House. We have had a recent example in the case of the Contagious Diseases Act. We now know very well that they have not achieved the results anticipated from them by those who were parties to that legislation, and I am afraid that if this motion be carried the same result may possibly follow. I have recently come from the East where I have inquired into this question of the opium traffic, and as far as I have been able to acquaint myself of the facts I can substantiate all that has fallen from the hon. member who has just spoken. There is one point that I should like to bring before the House. Whenever this House, out of mistaken notions of goodness or of conferring benefit on the people of India or of our Crown colonies, has attempted to interfere without a thorough knowledge of the conditions under which the people live it has generally made a mistake. Take the question of the labour laws in the Straits Settlements. The labour employed in the Straits Settlements has been almost entirely procured from China. It is the Chinese who perform almost the whole of the labour there, and it is a fact that in the labour agreements which are made in that part of the world the labourers will not engage to do the work required of them on the plantations or elsewhere, unless they are certain that they can procure opium, just in the same way as among our large centres of population men will not engage to do work unless they can get tobacco and other things that they require. If you were to abolish this traffic I feel sure the result would be that at the best you would only bring about a modification of it. It is a mistake to think that you can change the character of a people simply by passing an Act of Parliament. There is too much of this sort of feeling entering into the desire to pass this kind of legislation. There is a Commission at this moment sitting in the Straits Settlements on the labour question. They do not know how to meet the difficulty there. It has been said by the hon. baronet who brought forward this motion that the Dutch were endeavouring to get rid of this traffic in Java. I do not know where the hon. baronet has obtained his information, but I do not think it is entirely accurate. There may be a few officials or other persons in Java who have the same views on this subject as the hon. baronet, and who therefore desire to abolish this traffic. Many people in this country no doubt wish to see a check put upon the opium traffic, but let me point out that the tobacco plantations at Java and Sumatra are entirely worked by Chinese who would not labour there unless they were sure of a supply of opium. Is it likely, then, the Dutch Government will put a stop to this profitable industry simply to give effect to philanthropic views. I confess I do not like the opium traffic myself. I think that something should be done to regulate it; in deference to public opinion in this country an effort should be made to bring it more under control. But I

(*Continued on page* 135.)

MR. HUME AS A "CORRECTOR OF THE PRESS."

Mr. A. O. Hume reached England early in April. Our readers will be sorry to learn that, during the first three weeks after his arrival he was confined to his house, his old lung complaint assailing him. Influenza, too, troubled him with a little of its unwelcome attention. In the unusual cold, keen weather of the past few weeks Mr. Hume has acted wisely in not leaving his home. As soon, however, as he landed, the Secretary of the Congress found duties awaiting him, one of which was to rap very severely the knuckles of certain gentlemen of the press who appear to go to their imagination for their facts. The two letters which follow tell their own story :—

"THE CONGRESS MOVEMENT IN INDIA.

" *To the Editor of the Manchester Courier.*

" Sir,—Your issue of the 7th instant containing the following paragraph has just been handed to me :—

" 'There can be no doubt about it that the much vaunted Congress movement in India is fast approaching its quietus. The end has been foreseen for months, and now the strange lack of funds will give it a speedy death. The fact is the Indian politicians were perfectly willing to gather together and make eloquent speeches and denounce existing laws enthusiastically as long as they were paid for their trouble. But they would not put their hand in their pockets for one farthing towards the support of the movement. Now the funds have become so low that it has been deemed necessary to make an appeal for aid to England. With that object Mr. A. O. Hume, who has all along been regarded as the leader of the Congress party, has just come to England. I understand that he will organise a series of meetings through the provinces, and that Manchester will be among the cities that will be accorded the doubtful honour of being asked to help to revive the dying movement.'

" I am sure you will be glad to learn that the Congress movement, so far from being moribund, is in a state of the most robust health; that so far from the funds being at a low ebb, the financial position was never so strong as it now is, and that there neither is nor ever has been the faintest idea of any appeal for pecuniary aid to the English public.

" We allow yearly £3,000 for our English work, and spend about £12,000 in India. We do not owe anyone a farthing, and we have already a permanent fund, which, as declared at the last Congress, we intend to raise to £200,000.

" We don't think we are in a bad way ourselves, but perhaps your correspondent knows more about our affairs than we do ourselves.—Yours, etc.,

" ALLAN O. HUME.

" The Châlet, April 9, 1891."

THE INDIAN CONGRESS.

" The Châlet, April 9, 1891.

" SIR,—Your issue of the 4th inst. has been handed me, containing the following paragraph :—

" 'Mr. A. O. Hume, a retired member of the Indian Civil Service, who has long taken up his residence in Simla, and who is the foremost leader of the Congress movement, came to this country by the last mail from Bombay. His journey is connected with the unsatisfactory condition of the Congress finances; for although the Bengalis support the movement vigourously in person, they are unable or unwilling to put their hands in their pockets for the purpose.' "

" As a matter of fact I only arrived in England three days after that paragraph appeared. I always come to England for the summer. My journey is in no way connected with the Congress finances, which are in an exceptionally satisfactory condition; and so far from the Bengalis being unwilling to put their hands in their pockets, they pay rather *more* (certainly not *less*) than their due share of the £15,000 which the Congress annually expends.—I am, &c. A. O. HUME."

BENARES AND ITS OFFICIALS.

HOW THE RECENT RIOTS WERE BROUGHT ABOUT.

(*From a Correspondent.*)

BENARES, *March* 18.

Benares is a sacred city of the Hindus, situated on a delta, almost surrounded by the rivers Ganges and Burna and a rivulet Asi. Moreover, ninety per cent. of the houses situated in the city have wells therein; more than fifty per cent. of these wells afford fresh and drinkable water. Those wells which are situated beyond the radius of a furlong from the banks of the rivers supply the best water imaginable. So in Benares, unlike other cities, Bombay, Calcutta, Bekaneer, &c.; any scarcity of water was never felt; nay, in most parts of the city, water being available at a very cheap cost, it has ever been used most profusely. When favoured with such advantages Benares felt no want of water, nor ever stirred or honestly strived to be supplied with a system of drainage or water works. There were large reservoirs and repositories where night soil and foul water collected—there were no sewers pouring into the rivers, and the water of the Ganges was as pure and wholesome as it ever was at Hardwar. But alas! time changed and with it came several calamities. About the year 1827 here came a Mr. Prinsep, who, according to his own imagination, thought it proper to let all the sewers fall into the sacred river and thus changed a natural supply of fresh water into a repository of foulness and filth. This he must have done in accordance with his own Christian notions of the matter, and quite against the wishes of the people. This state of things lasted till in 1873 Municipal Committees were established in the principal cities of the Empire with a view to improve the conditions thereof. By and by, these Municipal Commissioners and their chairman took it into their heads to purify the river Ganges—an object most laudable indeed, but very hard for the people who will have to pay for it. The Municipalities, as a rule, are generally composed of members who must be subservient to their chairman; and, who cannot act an independent part when presided over by the all-powerful Collector of the District, especially when they have to differ from their President. Such being the subserviency of the Commissioners, the chairman easily persuaded some well-to-do members of the Municipality, without any regard to the resources at their disposal, to represent the matter to the Government. Accordingly they declared their intention of supplying Benares with a system of drainage and water works before Lord Dufferin, for which they said they would supply the requisite amount from their own resources. As a matter of course, the noble Lord readily accepted this proposal of the Commissioners and became patron of "The Ganga Prasâdine Sabha" which was established to carry this grand proposal into effect. Engineers appointed for the purpose, estimated the cost of the scheme at 43 lakhs of rupees. This was an enormous sum, and was never anticipated by the members who projected the scheme. The Board fell into a sort of consternation, and, would, undoubtedly, have nipped the project in the bud, had not the present District officer, with a few more subservient members of the Board, succeeded in outvoting the minority. Thus it was resolved that the city must be furnished with water-works, &c., and the citizens must pay for it. The scheme proposed by Mr. Hughes was, at a considerable expense, submitted to the criticism of Mr. Latham, who reduced the estimate by two lakhs. Now, this estimate being a mere guesswork, there is no guarantee where the outlay will stop. This entire sum is to be raised by taxation. The Board has already taxed the poor citizens in several forms—house tax, water tax, wheel tax, drainage tax, octroi duties, &c.,—while many other forms of taxes are waiting behind. Imposition of taxes upon a poverty stricken people is odious in itself; the way in which it is assessed makes it trebly so. For instance, the house tax was, in the beginning, assessed by Municipal Commissioners at some 13 thousands; but the Collector being dissatisfied with the amount, appointed a Deputy Collector to reassess the houses—this gentleman ruthlessly trebled the amount assessed by the Commissioners, without any method. Now there is a cry all over the city. It is to be remembered that India has become too poor for the Indians, although it yields a golden harvest to the foreigners. Benares, in particular, is inhabited by a kind of beggars who live on the charity of others. To make such persons pay forty lakhs is not an easy thing. Several thousands of petitions have been filed by the poor inhabitants against the assessments of the Deputy Collector. Meetings are taking place and memorials being prepared for the Government—and there are cries of distress all over the city. What is there in the womb of futurity? God only knows. Food grains are selling at famine prices—wheat at 10 seers the rupee, rice at 8, ghee at 1, &c., &c.—and surely this is not the time to impose additional burdens on the poor ryots when they are with difficulty able to keep body and soul together. If the gigantic scheme is not stopped at once Benares will be ruined, and many families will leave the city for some places in the Moffusil.

Another series of events have occurred here which have exceedingly alarmed the people of Benares, and given a kind of gratuitous pain to the entire community; which read as follows: That a piece of land, some acres in area, has been appropriated by the local Government for the purposes of water-works. The ground thus taken is situated in Mohalla Bhadaini, and includes a Mandir (temple), dedicated to Sri Ram Chandra Ji, a place much resorted to by the public. The District officer wishing to have the aforesaid Mandir pulled down, the people of the locality rose in a body in great excitement, and convened a meeting to protest against the high-handed policy of the Collector, and to take steps to save the Mandir from destruction. Accordingly the Government was memorialized, and the Civil Authorities moved to consider the matter.

The Collector, in the meantime, summoned the recorded trustee of the Mandir to accept compensation for the same. This the trustee refused to do; the Mandir, he said, was Devattar, and the Múrti within Achal or immovable, hence, according to Hindu Dharma Shastra, neither could the Mandir be sold, nor the images removed to any other place. The Collector then appointed a few of the members of the Municipal Board to inquire into the matter from a Hindu point of view, and report thereon. These gentlemen, after carefully taking evidence from the Pandits and consulting Hindu Shastras, submitted their report to the effect that neither the Mandir, nor the Múrti of Ramchandzen, could be removed. A special meeting of the Municipal Board was called together to consider the report, and, after much discussion, it was decided to let the Mandir alone. Now, this decision of the Board did not tally with the wishes of the Collector, so he took to underhand proceedings, and got some of the nominated members to propose that the ground immediately surrounding the Mandir should be dug deep down, leaving no support to the walls of the same. This has already been done. Having thus undermined the walls of the building, the Collector referred the case to the judge for settling the amount of compensation, as he said it could not stand. The case is yet pending in the judge's court; the joint magistrate was also instigated to issue notice to the trustee—under sec. 133 c. P. C.—to evacuate the Mandir at once as it was in a dangerous condition (which has, as a matter of fact, been brought about by the machinations of the Collector himself). From all this it will be inferred that the Collector is quite determined to have the Mandir demolished at any cost. Such high-handed policy of the Collector is indeed unbearable, and it is such conduct of the officials that is undermining the very foundation of the British Empire by heaping unwarranted insults upon the faith and feelings of the people. The Durbhanga Temple case is yet fresh in the memory of the people, and this repetition of the same tactics will surely alienate their minds from the Government, and lead to bitterly sad results. Is not the conduct of the Collector most reprehensible?

INDIA.

A JOURNAL FOR THE DISCUSSION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

OFFICES: 25, CRAVEN STREET, CHARING CROSS, LONDON.

Communications for the Editor should be addressed "TO THE EDITOR OF *INDIA*", and, if intended for insertion, should be written *on one side of the paper only*, and must be authenticated by the real name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

Advertisements, Remittances, Subscriptions, Orders for Copies, and all such communications, should be addressed to "THE PUBLISHER OF *INDIA*", **25, Craven Street, Charing Cross, London.**

Cheques and Post-office Orders to be made payable to *William Digby*, and crossed National Provincial Bank of England, Limited.

Receipts not forwarded for Subscriptions unless the remittance is accompanied by a stamped envelope.

The Annual Subscription is 2s. 6d. post free in the United Kingdom, and Rs. 3 for India. The amount may be remitted by Post-office Order, or Order on a Mercantile House.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Several letters and articles are crowded out owing to the extreme length of Parliamentary proceedings.

INDIA.

MAY 1, 1891.

SIX GENERATIONS OF LOYALTY TO COUNT FOR NOTHING.

INDIA "NOT A FREE COUNTRY," BUT "GOVERNED ARBITRARILY BY THE STRONGEST DESPOTISM."

"THE hon. member had found grave fault with the exist- "ence of these 'arbitrary and despotic' regulations. "That opened up a large question if the House wished "to discuss it, but India was under a despotic Govern- "ment, and was not a free country; it was governed "arbitrarily by the strongest despotism, and the Regula- "tion of 1827 was one of those powers which had been "put into the hands of the Government of India, and "which, if the Government was to be arbitrary and "despotic, must be exercised from time to time." In such wise (but not wisely) spoke Sir John Gorst, Under-secretary of State for India, in the debate in the House of Commons, initiated by Mr. Conybeare, on the case of Sheikh Abdul Rasoul. Sir John appears, literally, to gloat over the despotism which exists in India. That despotism has never been more vigorously described than in the words he has used. This apologist for "arbitrary and despotic" rule seems to find pleasure in describing the features of such a rule. He, a Constitutional Minister, whose boast it is that he is a Tory Democrat, does not seem to care to consider how doctrines worthy of the Eldon, after whom, doubtless, he has been named, affect the persons who are ruled in accordance with them. The points involved in Sir John Gorst's strong declaration are of the utmost importance. For example: it may be asked, How many generations are to pass over the heads of a people, whose country is ruled by foreigners, before constitutionalism can take the place of despotism? In India, in the great majority of the settled Provinces, British rule has been paramount for six generations; in the Punjab, the latest of our great acquisitions, British rule has existed for nearly two generations. Of all the inhabitants of British India, save a few in the far North, there are no persons living who took part in the conflicts which preceded the establishment of British supremacy, or who have been subjects of any monarch save a British monarch. In Bengal, Madras, Bombay, and the North-West Provinces, every person now living was born a subject of the monarch of Great Britain. What is more, both they and those who, in the Central Provinces, Lower Burma, and the Punjab, have come into the Empire later, are British citizens by choice and not by compulsion. They have no desire to overthrow the domination of the present rulers: they are more than content that Britain should continue to be their over-ruler. Consequently, they declare their loyalty to the Empress of India and yield willing homage to her representatives. If these things do not constitute a claim to the release of some of the most odious features and practices of an iron-bound despotism, we wonder what would have such a result? It is clear that, in Sir John Gorst's opinion, loyalty counts for naught when it ought to rank above everything else. Not only must the dungeon-door be kept ever open and the person of an individual be liable to summary arrest, continued imprisonment without trial, and deportation be resorted to, but the Government, as a matter of duty, is compelled to make use of its powers in this respect! Mark Sir John Gorst's words: "If the Government is to be arbitrary and despotic, THOSE POWERS MUST BE EXERCISED FROM TIME TO TIME." Anglo-Indian rulers may find a justification in these words used by an Under Secretary, speaking *ex cathedrâ*, for any exercise of despotic power of which they may be guilty, and in the very Ark of the Covenant of Constitutionalism, the British House of Commons, their conduct will be defended. That is so long as eighteenth-century Eldonism is in office.

In presence of this fact, it may be well asked, wherein does British rule in India, in its fundamental positions, differ from that arbitrary despotism which we profess to have displaced? If there is no individual liberty in British India the Viceroy for the time being is on a level with Asiatic and European despots of hateful name and memory. Not law but individual caprice is supreme in India,—in British India at least. The experience of the unfortunate Muhammadan, whose treatment by the Government of India and the India Office was told in the House of Commons with great lucidity and force by Mr. Conybeare, is powerful in the object-lesson it affords of the way in which things are done in India. If Mr. Conybeare, or any other member of Parliament, could get at the facts concerning certain doings in the Punjab three or four years ago, he would find arbitrary interference with the liberty of the subject concerning not one person only, but some thousands of Her Majesty's subjects. If those who know the facts to which we refer would describe them in detail, a great step would be taken towards overthrowing despotism and in placing constitutional rule, and the law of the land in its stead. The Sheikh, whose name and experience have attracted so much attention of late, is apparently left without any remedy whatsoever. The rulers of India have chosen to arrest him on mere suspicion, to keep him in prison untried for nine months, and then to discharge him with never a word of apology or a rupee of recompense. And it is law-abiding Britain which thus acts!

The grave constitutional question involved in Sheikh Abdul Rasoul's case ought not to be allowed to rest until the Regulations of 1818 and 1827 are abrogated, and in their place settled law and individual rights are established, so that official injustice may be rendered impossible. In the meantime, let Indian constitutional reformers, men who gladly and sincerely proclaim that they are British subjects by choice, and wish to be able to greet their English fellow-subjects as brothers, note Sir John Gorst's emphatic repudiation of their loyal zeal and his prompt extinguishment of their fraternal ardour. "Brothers, indeed," he seems to respond: "we want none of your brotherhood! You are so little to be trusted, we have such complete want of faith in you, that we will not permit India to be anything but a despotically-ruled country; it is not free, it shall not be free: it is governed arbitrarily and its authorities rightly possess the most drastic weapons: more than that, by way of letting you fellows understand you are under the lash and are coerced by the sword, these weapons must be used from time to time." Such, in effect, are the assertions of the spokesman of the India Office in Parliament. The sincerity of the assertions is placed beyond doubt by potent acts. As witness the Government Indian Councils Bill and the persistent refusal of Lord Cross to introduce the most moderate scheme of elective representation into

the Councils which we propose to reform. Indian loyalty, as sincere and as devoted as any loyalty in the world, is to remain at the mercy of any official in India, while a fervid and sincere desire to serve the Empress and the fatherland is to be met by a declaration of Eldonian Toryism which, if it were effective, would, once for all, extinguish all constitutionalism in India. It is a curious problem in human nature that Sir John Gorst can at one and the same time be a democrat of the democrats in regard to English workmen and a despot of the most thorough kind towards his Indian fellow-subjects. The fact that English workmen have votes and the Indian people are franchiseless, of course, has nothing to do with the incongruity. But what, then, will explain the anomaly?

THE OPIUM REVENUE DEBATE AND DIFFICULTY.

THE only verbatim report of the debate in the House of Commons on the Opium revenue yet available to the public is that which finds a place in the pages of this issue of INDIA. How many persons who are unmeasured in their abuse of Sir Joseph Pease and his supporters in and out of Parliament will take the trouble to make themselves acquainted with what was really said and proposed by those who favour the abolition of the Government opium manufacture? It is easy to answer the question by saying that their number will be very small. That is, if we may judge from the manner in which the most violent of the critics of the Pease party have already acted. Sir Lepel Griffin is an example of what may be expected. With characteristic intemperance this ex-Indian civilian has denounced "the hundred and sixty geese" (to quote his own gentlemanly language) who wish to abolish the opium revenue. If this individual had read even the *Times'* incomplete report he would have found that Sir James Fergusson, as representing the India Office, and Mr. W. H. Smith, on the part of the Government, were in the same boat with the philanthropic baronet and the Griffin's "geese." Both the right hon. gentlemen we have named, in their speeches, go out of their way to take credit for the Indian Government having already reduced the manufacture of opium, while each declared it was a studied policy on the part of the Viceroy and his colleagues to bring about the entire abolition of the traffic. Sir Joseph Pease and his supporters only differed from the Government of India as to the rate at which abolition could be ensured: both parties were at one as to the end sought to be achieved. "The change cannot be made suddenly," said Sir James Fergusson, "*but it is being already made by degrees.*" The right hon. gentleman went on to claim credit for the Government of India in that one hundred thousand fewer acres are now devoted to poppy cultivation than was the case a few years ago. Mr. Smith was equally emphatic in the same direction. Apart from the division the debate showed that the Government were contesting with the Opposition critics for the honour of getting rid of a traffic for which they had no words of defence to offer. The reason for this is not hard to find. The Government of India and responsible people generally will take special heed of the fact. Sir James Fergusson and Mr. Smith spoke most respectfully of the anti-opium men. Why? Because they have realised that there is a strong body of opinion in Great Britain which is determined on the suppression of the traffic. It is no case now of "Nonconformist conscience" merely, but of the Christian conscience generally, being affronted. State Churchmen are as resolute in their determination to see an end speedily put to opium growing and manufacture in India as are Disestablishing Dissenters. This is a significant feature in the situation—a feature of which too much cannot be made. It is pregnant with important consequences.

It is easy to assert that English Christians are extremely hypocritical in their zeal to remove what they regard an iniquity in India while they are not taking like steps to remove a greater iniquity in their own country. The assertion has truth in it. Hypocrisy is apparent. But this much must be said in mitigation, that those who are most active in securing the abolition of the opium traffic are also very active in reducing the drink evil in England. This remark does not apply to the trimmers Fergusson, Smith, and others, but to the zealots to be found in both parties. However, when one has made the most admirable sallies in the direction of a *tu quoque* the fact of the determination of the reformers remains. Not a single anti-opium man will abate his ardour one jot for all the Griffins and the *St. James's Gazettes* in the universe. More than that, knowing the hold they have secured on the constituencies, "the Stigginses" and "the geese" will take care that every candidate for a seat at the next general election is pressed to pledge himself to vote for the abolition of the opium revenue. They will not be turned from their purpose by being told to look at home. They have power in the House of Commons over India and its affairs, more power than they have over their own land and over British drink producers and sellers, and if they cannot enforce righteousness in England they will remove temptations to vice in India. That is one of the penalties India has to pay for being ruled by a despotism controlled by a democratic assembly. Give India Councils of her own, of the semi-representative character which the National Congress desires, and the Indian Administration would no longer be the sport of the British Parliament any more than are our self-ruled colonies. However, there does not seem to be sense enough in the proper quarters to secure this desirable end, and Indian administrators must needs bow to the superior power of the "Stigginses" and the "geese." Whatever efforts may be made to minimise the significance of the vote of April 10 will make no difference in the long run. John Bull, in his assault upon the opium traffic, is in one of his most righteous moods, and will, most assuredly, have his way. The Indian Government would disarm its critics and act with great wisdom if it were to devise a plan wherein, say, by contracting the area of cultivation by so many thousands of acres at the end of each triennial period, it were to provide for the extinction of that trade in twenty-one or twenty-seven years. Should something of the kind not be attempted of its own motion, a more drastic course will be forced upon the Government, if not by this House of Commons, then certainly by the next. The Christian conscience does not intend to be defrauded of the act of National Righteousness to which it has made up its mind, no, not even if, in abolishing the opium revenue, much suffering is endured by the Indian tax-payer. Such suffering would be a vicarious offering for righteousness' sake, and probably would make the sacrifice more dear to the conscience of some English abolitionists!

We imagine much of what is written above will be very distasteful to the majority of our Indian readers who shudder at the thought of paying additional taxation in lieu of the opium revenue. No doubt they recognise that England will not bear the burden or any portion of it. They need be under no delusion on that score. We sympathise with the distrustfulness we forecast. But we have no desire that our readers should rest in a fool's paradise on this question. We know the English mind on such a subject as this. We know, too, the utter helplessness of the Indian people. We know, further, that Indian officials are always changing, that there is no continuity in Calcutta government to confront English persistency on a moral question. And, seeing all these things, we put the taxpayers' unpalatable fact, that a substitute will have to be found in India for the opium revenue, with a plainness which may not be misunderstood. Let the Indian people see that the needed revenue is found by retrenchment and not by taxation. Now is the time for urging a real reform in the Civil Service and in all the departments, especially in the Military Departments, General Sir George Chesney's last words of scare in India to the contrary notwithstanding.

(*Continued from page* 131.)

do object to legislation being undertaken without a sufficient knowledge of the subject. If a Royal Commission investigated it then hon. members would have before them details which would enable them to arrive at a just and right conclusion; they would have before them data of a practical character. I shall vote for this motion, not because I expect it will be carried, but because I am unable to bring forward that of which I have given notice. I should very much prefer that the Government could see its way to adopt my proposal, and have a Royal Commission to inquire into the traffic which it must be remembered is a legal traffic. At any rate some effort should be made to meet in this matter the wishes of a large section of the people of this country.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I have listened with very great interest to the debate which has been going on for the last three and a half hours, and with great interest also to the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I was a little surprised at the conclusion at which he arrived. He spoke with considerable force against the motion of the hon. baronet opposite, but wound up with an intimation of his intention to vote for the motion on the ground that he could not move an amendment of his own for the appointment of a Royal Commission. Now, I can assure the hon. member that there is every disposition on the part of the Government to take means to satisfy the people of this country and public opinion on this question, by making an inquiry which it is possible to institute. If the hon. gentleman desires that every information shall be obtained, the Government are perfectly ready to communicate with the Government of India with a view to an inquiry being conducted in the manner suggested by the hon. member, or in any other form by which information can be satisfactorily obtained for the people of this country. This is a very grave question indeed. The hon. baronet opposite introduced it in a speech of great moderation, but I cannot help recalling to the recollection of the House some of the statements which he made upon this question. Let us be moral and right without any regard to pecuniary considerations. That is a sentiment which does the hon. baronet great credit, and it is one in which we are all prepared to join with limitations. I would venture to suggest, sir, that we should have no regard whatever for pecuniary considerations, in matters where we ourselves alone are concerned, should those considerations interfere with the discharge of a moral duty; but at the same time, I hold it to be both moral and right that we should have regard to pecuniary considerations when we arrive at a resolution which affects other persons. I occasionally take refuge when I have to consider questions of administration, in the storehouse of moral axioms which is constituted by Hansard, and occasionally I find it possible to borrow axioms from the lips of the right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian. Now that right hon. gentleman speaking on the question only a few years ago, said: "There is a kind of morality, which, in my opinion, is the lowest of all, and it is the morality of a Government which makes promises without knowing that it had the means of fulfilling them." Now, the hon. baronet asks this House and this Government practically to make a promise without knowing that it has the means of fulfilling it. The right hon. gentleman suggested that if the House desired to effect a reform it should be prepared at once to assure the Government of India that it would provide it with that revenue of which it would be deprived if this traffic were suppressed. The hon. baronet dealing with the same point said there could be no doubt that the money would be forthcoming, and that the revenue would be found by the country, or at any rate there might be a postponement of the charge for expenditure actually incurred, and its payment extended over a period of years. It appears to me that a recommendation to postpone the payment of debt by the Government of India, is not a kind of morality which we ought to enforce upon the Government. Is the hon. baronet prepared to move an address to the Crown, setting forth that the Imperial Government is prepared to make good to the Government of India such a deficit as may arise from the suppression of the opium traffic? I know that my hon. friend the member for the City of London does propose to give effect to that principle, and desires that the House should agree to a financial resolution of that kind; but I would suggest to the hon. baronet that such an address to the Crown ought to be a resolution preliminary to one condemning the traffic in opium.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE: When I concluded my speech I stated, in certain carefully guarded language, that I was prepared to assure the people of India of an annual grant from the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of meeting any deficit which might be occasioned by the suppression of the traffic.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Then I would suggest to the hon. baronet that he should make that resolution antecedent to the one condemning the traffic in opium.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE: I am quite prepared to add it to my resolution.

Mr. SMITH: There is a good deal to be said in favour of such a resolution, and if the hon. baronet desires to withdraw the resolution now before the House and add a clause to that effect, then we shall be in a position to consider the whole question. What I wish to point out to the hon. baronet, who, I believe, is thoroughly in earnest in what he is advocating, is that we are asked to agree to an abstract resolution without any indication on his part that if that abstract resolution is carried and if the consequences thereof is a loss to the revenues of India, a grant will be made from the Exchequer of Great Britain to make up that deficit. No doubt the hon. baronet would be prepared to advocate such a grant, but I think the House will agree with me that that would hardly be a satisfactory mode of discharging our duty to the inhabitants of India. We should deprive them of certain revenues, and at the same time there would be by no means a certainty that this House or the country would be prepared to make good the revenues thus taken from them. The course which this Government has taken, and which all Governments have taken for the last few years—for the present Government takes no credit for greater care and consideration for the morality of the people of India than has been shown by preceding Governments—has been to diminish the area of cultivation in India to an extent in the last five years at any rate of 20 per cent. The production and sale of opium has been decreased considerably in each year, and that must be taken as an indication of the policy of the Government. But we are not prepared and we are not able to accept a resolution which would terminate the production of opium in India and at once deprive the revenues of India of a large sum. If we were to attempt to do that illicit sale and production would be the result, and the consequences would be far more serious than those arising under the present system. Our policy has greatly diminished the cultivation and consumption of the drug, and that policy which has been carried on with marked success during the last five years would be persevered in, but we cannot accept the resolution couched in the language of the hon. baronet, unless this House is prepared to precede it by a positive engagement on the part of this country to make good to the revenues of India the enormous sum of which it would suddenly be deprived by a desire—a very proper and humane desire—on the part of the people of this country to protect the people of India from the consequences of this traffic. I think the House will agree that the course which I am suggesting is a very proper one and would meet all practical purposes. I say, again, that this House must in the first instance pledge itself to make good to the revenues of India any loss of which it might be deprived by the suppfession of the opium trade, and until that is done the Government cannot assent to the course suggested by the hon. baronet.

The House divided.

For Sir J. Pease's motion	160
Against ,, ,, ...	130
Majority for..	30

Question put that these words be there added. Agreed.

Sir R. FOWLER (London): I beg to move the addition which stands in my name.

Question proposed to add at the end of the motion "And this House feeling the pressure of taxation on the people of India will take steps to reimburse the deficiency so caused to the Indian Government."

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): I should like to hear the views of the Government. Is is surprising to me that a gentleman of the great experience of the hon. baronet the member for the City of London should have delivered himself in such a brief space on so important a question, I have known him to make long speeches on matters of far less importance. I can hardly think he limited his speech solely by reference to the state of the clock. Now, sir, it seems to me very unfortunate, indeed, if by reason of the limited period—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

And it being one o'clock Mr. Speaker left the chair.

The following are the members who voted Aye and No:—

AYES.

Addison, John
Agg-Gardner, James T.
Allsopp, Hon. Geo. (Worcester)
Amherst, Wm. Amherst Tyssen
Anstruther, H. T. (St. Andrew's)
Anstruther, Col. Lloyd (Suffolk)
Ashmead-Bartlett, Ellis
Bailey, Sir Joseph R.
Baird, John George Alexander
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Gerald William (Leeds)
Barry, A. H. Smith (Hunts)
Barry, Francis Tress (Windsor)
Bass, Hamar
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Beach, W. W. Bramston (Hants)
Bentinck, Lord H. C. (Norfolk)
Bethell, Commander
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Col. Hen. Blundell H.
Bond, George Hawkesworth
Bowles, Capt. Henry Ferryman
Bristowe, Thomas Lynn
Brodrick, Hon. St. John
Bruce, Gainsford (Finsbury)
Burghley, Lord
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clarke, Sir Edward (Plymouth)
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Cornwallis, F. S. Wykeham
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Cross, Hon. Wm. H. (Liverpool)
Crossley, Sir Savile B. (Suffolk)
Crossman, General Sir William
De Worms, Rt. Hn. Baron Henry
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Ebrington, Viscount
Edwards-Moss, Tom C.
Egerton, Hon. Tatton
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, Hn. Art. R. D. (Roxburghs)
Eyre, Colonel Henry
Farquharson, Dr. R. (Aberd'sh)
Fellowes, Ailwyn Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)
Finch, George H.
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, R. Uniacke Penrose
FitzWygram, Sir Frederick
Forwood, Arthur Bower
Gathorne-Hardy, Hn. J. S. (Kent)
Gedge, Sydney
Goldsworthy, Major-General
Goschen, Rt. Hon. Geo. Joachim
Grimston, Viscount
Gunter, Colonel
Hall, Alexander Wm. (Oxford)
Hall, Sir Charles, (Cambridgesh.)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G. (Midx.)
Hardcastle, Frank (Lanc. S.E.)
Harland, Sir Edward James
Hartington, Rt. Hn. Marquis of
Herbert, Hon. Sidney
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Hill, Rt. Hn. Lord Arthur (Down)
Hill, A. Staveley (Staffordsh.)
Hill, Col. Edwd. Stock (Bristol)
Hinckes, Harry Tichborne
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead)
Hoare, Samuel (Norwich)
Hunt, Frederick Seager
Hutchinson, Capt. G. W. Grice-
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Jarvis, Alexander Weston
Kelly, John R.
Kerans, Frederick Harold
King, Henry Seymour (Hull)
Knowles, Lees
Lawrence, Sir Trevor (Surrey)
Lechmere, Sir Edmund A. H.
Leigh, Thos. Wodehouse (Lanc.)
Leighton, Stanley
Lennox, Lord Walter, C. Gordon
Lewisham, Viscount
Long, Walter Hume
Lowther, Jas. W. (Cumberland)
Macartney, W. G. Ellison
Maclean, James Mackenzie
Madden, Dodgson Hamilton
Maguire, James Rochfort
Malcolm, Col. John Wingfield
Matthews, Rt. Hon. Henry
Maxwell, Sir Herbert E.
More, Robert Jasper
Morrison, Walter
Mowbray, R. G. C. (Lanc. S.E.)
Muntz, Philip A.
Murdoch, Charles Townshend
Newark, Viscount
Noble, Wilson
Northcote, Hon. Sir H. Stafford
Parker, Hon. Francis (Oxf'dsh.)
Pearson, Sir Charles John
Plowden, Sir William Chichele
Plunket, Rt. Hon. David R.
Powell, Francis Sharp
Raikes, Rt. Hon. Henry Cecil
Reed, Henry Byron (Bradford)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Rt. Hon. J. P. B. (Bute)
Robinson, Brooke (Dudley)

Salt, Thomas	Tollemache, Henry James
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles	Vincent, Chas. Edw. Howard
Sidebottom, T. Harrop (Stalybr.)	Webster, Sir R. E. (Isle of Wight)
Smith, Rt. Hn. Wm. H. (Strand)	Wharton, John Lloyd
Stanhope, Rt. Hn. E. (Lincolnsh.)	Whitley, Edward
Stokes, Sir George Gabriel	Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Sykes, Christopher	Wodehouse, Edmond Robert
Temple, Sir Richard	Wortley, Charles Beilby Stuart-
Theobald, James	

Tellers for the Ayes, Mr. Akers-Douglas and Sir William Walrond.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Limerick)	M'Arthur, Alexander (Leicester)
Acland, A. H. Dyke (Yorks)	M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Acland, C. T. Dyke (Cornwall)	M'Carthy, Justin (Londonderry)
Asher, Alexander	M'Donald, Dr. Roderick
Asquith, Herbert Henry	M'Lagan, Peter
Atherley-Jones, L.	M'Laren, Walter S. B.
Ballantine, Wm. Henry Walter	Maitland, William Fuller
Barbour, William Boyle	Mallock, Richard
Barran, John	Manfield, Moses Philip
Bartley, George C. T.	Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Beaufort, Mark Hanbury	Marjoribanks, Rt. Hon. Edward
Bickford-Smith, William	Mather, William
Birrell, Augustine	Morgan, Rt. Hn. G. O. (Denbighs)
Blane, Alexander	Morley, Arnold (Nottingham)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire)	Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Newcastle)
Bridgeman, Col. Hon. Fran. C.	Morrogh, John
Bright, John A. (Birmingham)	Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Brown, Alex. H. (Salop)	Mundella, Rt. Hon. Anthony John
Brown, Alex. Laing (Hawick)	Neville, Ralph
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn	Newnes, George
Burt, Thomas	O'Brien, James F. X. (Mayo)
Caldwell, J.	O'Connor, Arthur (Donegal)
Cameron, Charles (Glasgow)	Oldroyd, Mark
Cameron, J. Macdonald (Wick)	Parker, Charles Stuart (Perth)
Campbell, James A. (Glas. Univ.)	Paulton, James Mellor
Causton, Richard Knight	Pease, Alfred E. (York)
Chance, Patrick Alexander	Philipps, John Wynford
Channing, Francis Allston	Pickard, Benjamin
Coghill, Douglas Henry	Potter, Thomas Bayley
Coleridge, Hon. Bernard	Priestley, Briggs
Collery, Bernard	Provand, Andrew Dryburgh
Colman, Jeremiah James	Quinn, Thomas
Conybeare, Chas. A. Vansittart	Randell, David
Cozens-Hardy, Herbert Hardy	Reed, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Craven, Joseph	Reid, Robt. Threshie (Dumfries)
Crawford, Donald	Roberts, John Byrn (Eifion)
Crossley, Edward (Yorks. W.R.)	Roe, Thomas
Dalrymple, Sir Charles	Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Davey, Sir Horace	Roscoe, Sir H. Enfield
Dickson, Thomas A. (Dublin)	Round, James
Dixon, George (Birmingham)	Rowlands, James (Finsbury)
Duncan, James Archibald	Rowlands, W. Bowen (Card'sh.)
Elliot, Hn. Hugh F. H. (Ayrsh.)	Rowntree, Joshua
Ellis, James (Leicestershire)	Russell, Sir Chas. (Hackney, S.)
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)	Russell, T. W. (Tyrone)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas	Saunderson, Col. Edw. James
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)	Seton-Karr, Henry
Fenwick, Charles	Sexton, Thomas
Flower, Cyril	Shaw, Thomas (Halifax)
Foley, Patrick James	Sinclair, William Pirrie
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)	Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Fowler, Sir Robert N. (London)	Spencer, Hn. C. R. (Northampton)
Fry, Lewis (Bristol)	Stanhope, Hon. P. (Wednesbury)
Fry, Theodore (Darlington)	Stephens, Henry Charles
Furness, Christopher	Stepney-Cowell, Sir Arthur K.
Gane, Lawrence	Stewart, Halley (Lincolnshire)
Gladstone, Herbert J. (Leeds)	Stuart James (Shoreditch)
Grey, Sir Edward (Northumb.)	Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath)
Gully, William Court	Summers, William
Hayne, Charles Seale-	Swinburne, Sir John
Healy, Maurice (Cork)	Talbot, John Gilbert
Healy, Timothy M. (Longford)	Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Hingley, Benjamin	Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Howard, Joseph	Thorburn, Walter
Hoyle, Isaac	Waddy, Samuel Danks
Illingworth, Alfred	Warmington, Cornelius M.
James, Hn. Walter H. (Gatesh'd)	Watt, Hugh
Joicey, James	Wayman, Thomas
Keay, John Seymour	Webb, Alfred
Kennaway, Sir John Henry	Weston, Sir Joseph Dodge
Lawson, H. L. W. (St. Pancras)	Whitbread, Samuel
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumb'land)	Will, John Shiress
Leake, Robert	Williams, Arthur (Glamorgan)
Leng, John	Williamson, Steph. (Kilm'nock)
Lewis, Thomas P. (Anglesey)	Wilson, Charles Henry (Hull)
Lloyd-George, David	Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Lockwood, Frank	Wilson, Isaac (Middlesborough)
MacInnes, Miles	Wilson, John (Lanark)
Mackintosh, Charles Fraser	Woodhead, Joseph
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift	Wright, Caleb (Lanc. S. W.)

Tellers for the Noes, Sir Joseph Pease and Mr. Mark Stewart.

APRIL 11.

THE OPIUM TRAFFIC IN INDIA.

Mr. A. McArthur (Leicester) presented petitions from the county and borough of Leicester against the manufacture and sale of opium, unless for medical purposes.

Petitions to a similar effect were presented by Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) from various places in the North of Ireland; by Mr. W. Macartney (Antrim, S.), from Randalstown and other places in Ireland; by Mr. Esslemont (Aberdeen, E.), from Fraserburgh, Aberdeen), Garioch, Kirkcaldy, from the Committee on Temperance of the United Presbyterian Church, and from the Kirk Session of the Free Church of Mongahitter, Aberdeen; by Mr. J. C. Stevenson (South Shields), from South Shields; and by Sir Joseph Pease (Durham, Barnard Castle), from Burton-on-Trent, Wareham Dorset, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Morpeth, Wheelton, Worksop, New Brighton, Wolverhampton, Wakefield, Ripon, Boston Spa, Burnley, Tamworth, Lancaster, Coniston, Buckhurst Hill, Beckenham, Birkenhead, Grimsby, Dublin, Carysfort, Philipstown, Mountmelleck, Taunton, Cork, Kingstown, Bristol, York, Ipswich, Reigate, Gateshead, Cardiff, Croydon, Kent, the South India Conference of the Methodist Church in Session at Bangalore, Landport, Cavan, Limerick, Llanelly, Newry, Sussex, Waterford, Herts, Dunfermline, London, Gainsborough, Norfolk, Wexford, the British Women's Temperance Society, Lincolnshire, Whitehaven, Somerset, Greenock, Margate, Tunbridge Wells, Barnet, Halifax, Falmouth, Eastbourne, Monmouth, Hants, Dumbarton, Ipswich, Salford, Edinburgh, Preston, Isle of Man, Dundee, Shropshire, Colchester, Sligo, Bideford, Surrey, Middlesex, Leamington, Bournemouth, Monaghan, Southport, Donegal, Kendal, Tynemouth, Rochdale, Driffield, Birmingham, Londonderry, Weston-super-Mare, Hereford, Liverpool, Arrahbrogue, Dover, Cambridge, Tintern, Dorset, Southsea, Staffordshire, Glamorgan, Kildare, Tipperary, Devon, Bucks, Kerry, Pembroke, Manchester, Chester, Portsmouth, Whitehaven, Wicklow, Bedgellert, Torquay, Stirling, Cumberland, Poole, Great Yarmouth, a petition from India, containing 4,129 signatures, and embracing thirty nationalities of India and Burma, Chorley and Glasgow. On the motion of the hon. baronet the prayer of these petitions was read by the clerk at the table.

Mr. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether opium, the manufacture of the Indian Government, imported into the United Kingdom for the use of Chinese or others for smoking or other purposes, will be allowed to be sold here as in India without being labelled "Poison", as is required by law to be done as regards opium sold for use as medicine and under penalties enforceable in the criminal courts.

The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Matthews, Birmingham, E.): According to the provisions of the Pharmacy Act, opium cannot be sold in Great Britain unless together with the name of the article the word "poison" is used, and the name and address of the seller are given.

ABDUL RASOUL.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether he has further considered the case of Abdul Rasoul, and what he proposes to do for him?

The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir J. Fergusson, Manchester, N.E.): In the absence of my right hon. friend the Under Secretary for India I am requested to say that Abdul Rasoul was offered the payment of his expenses in this country, a passage to Bombay, and a safe conduct to Kashmir. He declined these terms unless he also received some Government appointment, or a pecuniary equivalent. The Secretary of State refused to extend the offer specified above, and on the 20th of March Abdul Rasoul was informed that if he did not avail himself of these terms within fourteen days they would be withdrawn. He has made no communication since then.

Mr. CONYBEARE: I should like to be informed what the offence was for which Abdul Rasoul was imprisoned, and whether he is not entitled to some compensation for the illegal manner in which he was arrested and imprisoned for nine months in India without trial and without any accusation of any kind having been brought against him. I ask the right hon. gentleman whether the Government are prepared to admit that the imprisonment of Abdul Rasoul was illegal, or what the accusation was upon which he was imprisoned?

Sir J. FERGUSSON: The hon. member put the same questions some time ago, and they were answered by my right hon. friend the Under Secretary.

Mr. CONYBEARE: I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon. My question has not been answered yet. What I want to know is what justification the Government had for kidnapping Abdul Rasoul and keeping him in prison without trial for nine months?

Sir J. FERGUSSON: I will read the answer of my right hon. friend to which I referred. "If Abdul Rasoul demands compensation he should address himself in the first instance to the Government of India, and, in the event of the Government refusing redress, he should appeal to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State is not in possession of information to enable him to answer the question."

Mr. CONYBEARE: The Under Secretary promised some time ago to get information. May I ask whether the Government have obtained it, and when it will be communicated to the House?

Sir J. FERGUSSON: That question does not arise out of the answer to the question on the paper, and as I do not represent the Indian Department I decline to go into it.

APRIL 13.

THE OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Mr. M'DONALD CAMERON (Wick) said: I wish to ask the right hon. gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury a question of which I have given him private notice, viz., whether in view of the vote taken on Friday last in this House against the motion of the hon. baronet the member for the Barnard Castle division of Durham on the opium traffic, and in view also of the strong feeling which exists in this country against that traffic, Her Majesty's Government are prepared to give effect to my proposal that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the whole subject, and thereby to furnish this House with authentic data as to the character and extent of the opium traffic.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: The hon. gentleman has asked me a question with regard to the vote given on Friday evening last. I may say that from my own point of view the proceedings in regard to that matter are incomplete at the present moment. The hon. baronet who brought forward the motion expressed his willingness to accept an addendum to that motion. That addendum was moved by my right hon. friend the member for the City of London; but, unfortunately, no decision of the House was come to upon it. I hardly know whether it is practic-

able now to take a decision upon the whole question in the form in which it now stands, and in reference to the addendum moved by the hon. baronet; but certainly the Government are of opinion that the sense of the House has not been expressed upon the whole question, and that until that sense has been expressed I do not think the Government could take any proceeding in the way of making any communication to the Indian Government upon the subject. No doubt the Government of India will take their own course upon the matter; but as far as we are concerned we feel that the question is not in that complete state in which we are called upon to take any proceedings.

The MARQUIS OF HARTINGTON (Rossendale): Perhaps, sir, with your permission I might be allowed to put a question to you, viz., Whether it is in your power to state to the House what is the exact position of the motion of the hon. baronet, the member for the Barnard Castle Division of Durham, and the amendment of the right hon. gentleman, the member for the City of London. I see that the motion still remains on the paper as attached to the sixteenth order of the day on the motion for the Order for Supply in Committee. I presume, however, that even if that order can be reached to-night, the adjourned debate which was not concluded on Friday night could not be continued; and I presume that you would leave the Chair without any question put. I desire now to ask whether the motion to which I have referred would remain for an indefinite time attached to the order for going into Supply, and if not in what form it will remain on the order book, and in what manner it is possible, if the House desires to do so, to resume the discussion on the motion of the amendment of the right hon. gentleman opposite?

Mr. SPEAKER: The noble lord has mistaken the exact position of the question. On the question that "I now leave the Chair" presented to the House last Friday, the hon. baronet the member for the Barnard Castle Division of Durham moved an amendment. The motion that "I now leave the Chair" was negatived, and the motion of the hon. baronet, the member for the Barnard Castle Division then became the substantive question. It will be in the recollection of the House that I put after the first division the question "that these words be there added", thus presenting this as a definite question before the House. To that an amendment was moved which by lapse of time became an adjourned debate. The House will therefore observe that the House has passed no definite opinion either on the original amendment which is the substantive question or upon the question proposed to be moved to the substantive question in consequence of the lapse of time. I shall have to put the question again as a definite substantive Resolution to the House on the subject of opium and if an amendment were moved, and if that amendment were carried, I should then have to put the whole question with the amendment attached to it, and then the House would express its opinion upon the substantive question together with the amendment, if that amendment were passed. The noble lord asks me what becomes of it now. On a Monday or on a Thursday I am authorised by the Standing Orders when I put the question "that I now leave the Chair"—assuming that the order was down for those nights—I am authorised to leave the Chair without question put. Therefore I shall not to-night be able to pay attention to the appendage to that motion which was allowed to lapse in Supply on Friday last. If I am asked what will happen on Friday next, I shall then have to put, not the question of the hon. baronet the member for the Barnard Castle Division, but the question "that I now leave the Chair", to which the other motions which may be put down as amendments to that question will have to be put and would take precedence of any other question. Having got, therefore, so far as Friday, if the House will be good enough to follow me, I know not what becomes of the amendment, or the Resolution I may call it, which is now on the paper in the name of the hon. baronet the member for the Barnard Castle Division, after Friday next. But it would, of course, be competent for the Government, if they wish it, to treat it as a motion. It will be in their power under the Standing Orders to make it one of the orders of the day. That entirely rests in the discretion of the Government. I do not think any other further point arises so far as I am concerned.

Sir J. PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle): I would ask my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposes to make that Motion that this Resolution be an order of the day? With the leave of the House, I should like just to say that my right hon. friend opposite, has hardly correctly represented my view with regard to the motion in the amendment moved by my hon. relative and friend the member for the City of London. I said I was quite prepared to accept the principle employed in his amendment, but I was not prepared to accept his exact words, and I also read to the House the words I was prepared to accept as an addition to my now substantive Resolution.

Mr. J. M. MACLEAN (Oldham): Before the right hon. gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury replies, I should like to ask him whether the Government intend to take the amendment of the right hon. gentleman, the member for the City, seriously? I should like to ask them if they propose to place this unjust and intolerable burden on the English taxpayer?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: The question now assumes an entirely new character, and I am not prepared to state to the House whether or not the Government are prepared to adopt the motion of the hon. baronet as an order of the day, or put it on the paper with that object. I may state generally our view, that this Resolution is a matter which requires futher consideration before it is accepted by the House. We shall on a later day state whether or not we can offer facilities to the hon. baronet for making progress with his Resolution.

The subject dropped.

APRIL 16.

THE FAILURE OF AMMUNITION AT MANIPUR.

Mr. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether he is in a position to give any information as to the alleged statement that the troops employed in the Manipur expedition were at the time of the recent disaster without an adequate or suitable supply of reserve ammunition to fit their rifles?

The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA, (Sir J. Gorst, Chatham): Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to answer this question. The Secretary of State has no information as to the truth or otherwise of these statements.

Mr. WEBSTER: I beg to give notice that I will call attention to the subject on the Army Estimates.

FOREST REGULATIONS IN BOMBAY.

Mr. MACNEILL (Donegal S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether the inquiry forwarded to the Government of Bombay in August last respecting the forest regulations in the districts of Colaba and Thana has yet been answered:

And, whether he will grant, as an unopposed Return, a Copy of the new Regulations which have been issued for the districts named?

Sir J. GORST: No, sir, the answer has not yet been received. The matter was under discussion in Bombay last year. As soon as the report is received I will consider what papers can be laid upon the table.

RIOTS AMONG BENGAL INDIGO CULTIVATORS.

Mr. MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether the inquiry into the alleged riots among the indigo cultivators in Bengal, promised in April, 1890, has been made; and, if so, whether he will lay the result of such inquiry, with all Papers, if any, upon the Table?

And, whether a report from the Government of India, as to the circumstances in, and conditions under which indigo is cultivated, has been received; and, if so, whether he will lay it upon the Table?

Sir J. GORST: Yes, sir: the papers in this case were delivered last month, I understand that they are now being printed and will be shortly circulated.

A PERMANENTLY-SETTLED LAND REVENUE IN THE NORTH-WEST PROVINCES.

Mr. MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India, with regard to the fact that, under the Court Fees Act in the North-West Provinces, the valuation of land in permanently settled districts is fixed at ten times the annual rental, whereas in districts not permanently settled the valuation is only five times the annual rental, whether, in view of this official testimony, and the greater value of permanently settled land, and in view also of conditions laid down in the correspondence on the subject, the Secretary of State will redeem the pledge given in 1862, and proceed to permanently settle the land still held on a 30 years' settlement in Madras, Bombay, parts of Bengal, the North-West Provinces, the Punjab, and the Central Provinces; and, whether he will state why there has been so great a delay in carrying out the arrangements decided upon nearly 30 years ago?

Sir J. GORST: I think the hon. member has fallen into a little error. There is no delay to explain. The matter was considered in 1862, and in accordance with the recommendation of a Select Committee in 1871, a final order formally abandoning the arrangement was issued in 1883.

Mr. MACNEILL: Is the right hon. gentleman aware that a resolution was passed at the last session of the Indian National Congress urging on the Government the extension of the permanent land system?

Sir J. GORST: That is entirely new matter. The arrangement of thirty years ago was distinctly abandoned some years ago, and the resolution referred to by the hon. member deals with entirely new matter.

DISCONTENT IN THE MADRAS REGISTRATION DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether the attention of the Secretary of State has been drawn to the serious discontent prevailing among the registering officers, chiefly among the sub-registrars, and among their clerks, of the Registration Department of the Madras Presidency, due to the reduced scale of remuneration sanctioned by the Madras Government in 1882 to 1885, respectively:

Whether the Secretary of State is aware of the large amount of surplus that is being accumulated and absorbed into the general revenues from the registration fees, intended, originally—an intention recently reaffirmed by the Government of India—for the sole maintenance of the Department and the pensionary charges of its officers, and not as a source of profit to the Government:

Whether the Secretary of State is aware that the Government of India have, in their review of the triennial reports for the period ending 1889-90 of the several Local Governments and Administrations on the working of the Administration Department, expressed their opinion condemning the large surplus that has been accumulated year by year from registration fees, and have, accordingly, directed local authorities to take steps to reduce the surplus:

And, whether he will take the present opportunity to press upon the Madras Government the urgent necessity that has arisen to sanction increased expenditure in order to allay the discontent of a Department composed of Indians by a re-organisation of the grades of sub-registrars and registrars, and of their clerks?

Sir J. GORST: The answer to the first paragraph of the question of the hon. member is in the negative. The answer to the second and third paragraphs is that the view taken by the Government of India as to the surplus is that it shall be devoted to providing facilities for registration. This policy was re-affirmed in the review of the triennial reports referred to by the hon. member. The answer to the fourth paragraph of the question is that the Secretary of State is advised not to urge the Government of India to raise the salaries of the registration officers or of any other department.

THE IMPRISONMENT, WITHOUT TRIAL, OF SHEIKH ABDUL RASOUL.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether he has yet received the information from the authorities in India respecting the case of Sheikh Abdul Rasoul, promised on 16th February; if so, on what date was such information received, and what is its purport; if not, will

he explain the delay which has taken place in the obtaining of this information:

Whether he can now state what number of Her Majesty's Indian subjects have been imprisoned under the provisions of Regulation III of 1818, or deprived of their property since that date to the present time:

Whether he is aware that Regulation III of 1818, to which he recently referred, applies only to Bengal, and not to Bombay:

Would he state to the House what were the reasons of State, and upon what facts or evidence they were based, which necessitated the detention of Abdul Rasoul for nine months in gaol without trial:

And, whether the Government still refuse to make any compensation to Abdul Rasoul for the treatment he has received?

As the Under Secretary of State is in his place perhaps he will answer the question?

Sir J. GORST: The statement made by me on the 16th of February was that a communication addressed by Abdul Rasoul to the Secretary of State had been forwarded to India, and that the Secretary of State would consult the Government of India before taking any action thereon. The Government of India in the same month informed the Secretary of State that Abdul Rasoul, on being released from confinement, applied to be sent back to Kashmir. On receiving this information, the Secretary of State made the offer which I have already stated to the House. In answer to the next question I can only repeat the answer which I gave previously. The Secretary of State positively declines to say what number of Indian subjects have been imprisoned under the provisions of Regulation III of 1818, or deprived of their property, since that date to the present time. With regard to the third question the hon. member is right. Regulation III of 1818 applies only to Bengal and not to Bombay. It is still in force. In answer to paragraph four, the Government of India are satisfied that Abdul Rasoul was employed as an emissary of the Maharajah Dhulip Singh in issuing proclamations against the Queen. When he applied for his release it was granted. In answer to the fifth paragraph I have to say that the Government does not refuse to make compensation to Abdul Rasoul. As I have already stated more than once, if Abdul Rasoul demands compensation he must address himself, in the first instance, to the Government of India.

Mr. CONYBEARE: I have had cause to trouble the right hon. gentleman so frequently without obtaining a satisfactory assurance from him, that I shall ask leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to raise the question.

THE BLACK MOUNTAIN EXPEDITION.

Mr. PHILIPPS (Lanark, Mid): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether it is the case, as has been stated in the newspapers, that some of the reserve forces of the Black Mountain Expedition have been ordered to the front; and, if so, whether he is in a position to inform the House what regiments have been thus moved forward?

Sir J. GORST: The reserve force of the Black Mountain Expedition has been ordered to the front, but not in the direction of the Black Mountain. It has been ordered to Kotah. Full details of the forces composing the expedition have not yet been received from India, but it will include the 3rd British mounted battery; the 1st Battalion of the King's Royal Rifles, the 1st and 6th Punjaub Infantry, and a regiment of Goorkhas.

THE TREATMENT OF SHEIKH ABDUL RASOUL.

Mr. CONYBEARE rose and asked leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the arrest of one of Her Majesty's Indian subjects in Bombay, his imprisonment for nine months in the fort at Assirgad, and his subsequent deportation to London without trial or accusation having been brought against him.

The SPEAKER having asked if it was the pleasure of the House that leave should be given, more than forty members rose.

Mr. CONYBEARE: I am loth to trouble the House with a motion of this kind, but there are members in the House who will recollect that I have again and again pressed the Under Secretary of State for India with questions on the subject without receiving any reply I could consider sufficient, and it is because the question involves not only a case of very great hardship and maltreatment to a particular Muhammadan subject of Her Majesty, but also because it involves a question of principle relating to the Government of India generally that I consider it to be of sufficient importance to justify the step I am taking this evening. I am sure there are not many members in this House who would have credited the statement had anyone told them before this case arose that it is in the power of Her Majesty's Government in India to act as they have acted in relation to this Muhammadan gentleman, Sheikh Abdul Rasoul. I will briefly recapitulate the facts as they are stated to me, and as they have been admitted to be in the answers I have received from members of the Government to questions I have put in the House. All I can say is whether the Government can justify their action under old-fashioned regulations which they admit to be the authority under which they have acted or not, I hope at any rate the House will come to the conclusion that

OLD REGULATIONS PASSED IN TIME OF TURMOIL AND CONFUSION AND WARFARE,

in the early days of our Indian Empire, are no longer suited to the requirements of modern times and ought either to be repealed at once or at any rate ought not to be acted upon without far more than the bare suspicion which I believe her Majesty's Government now allege to be the ground of their action. Sheikh Abdul Rasoul was born in Kashmir, which place he left thirty-five years ago. He remained one year in Mecca, and lived in Constantinople for thirty years, where he received forty-five guineas per month as a professor of languages to the college, and where he was a member of the academy. After the Russian war with Turkey he left Constantinople and came to London, where, having a little money, he published an Arabic and Persian newspaper, called *Gairat*. He remained in London ten years and then returned to Constantinople. During his residence in London Sheikh Abdul Rasoul maintained himself partly by teaching languages, and received support also from his countryman, Perbuksh. He left Constantinople again, after three months' stay, and went to Moscow, where he stopped four months. He was supported all this time by friends. From Moscow he journeyed to Berlin, where he stayed ten days, and then went to Paris. He left that city for London after one month's stay. After remaining in London for one month he went to Cairo, where he lived for two years. He again returned to Paris for two months, whence he went to Cairo and Bombay. He was travelling all the time for pleasure. He corresponded with the British Government during his travels. He took a great deal of interest in the Soudan war. I place these details before the House to show that there is nothing this gentleman desires to conceal.

HIS LIFE HAS BEEN MORE OR LESS A PUBLIC ONE,

or at any rate portions of his time, and if he has been in correspondence with members of the Government—I do not mean this Government in particular—and with the Maharajah Dhulip Singh, that, in the absence of far more weighty evidence than has been vouchsafed by the Government, does not entitle the Government to treat him as he has been treated. What was that treatment? When he arrived at Bombay in January last year, he was arrested by the Commissioner of Police, his clothes and boots were cut to pieces on pretence of discovering if he had any treasonable communications concealed about his person; he was then placed on the railway and carried to the island fortress of Assirgad, and there detained nine months, after which he was removed to Bombay, under arrest, placed on board a P. and O. steamer, and landed, friendless, penniless, and homeless, in the London docks, and but for the care taken of him by certain friends, who fortunately have the means of ascertaining these facts, taking up a case like this, and bringing it before the House and the country, this unfortunate man, for aught the Government cared, might have perished of starvation in this city. Now the answer of the Government, so far as the question of deportation is concerned, is that they did not deport, that this gentleman asked to come back to England of his own free will. Well, that is an official explanation. I place before the House, and by the side of it, and in direct opposition to it, the deliberate statement of Abdul Rasoul himself, and I will ask the House to say which party is most worthy of credence, the Government who have deported this unfortunate man under a Regulation which, according to the admission of the Government, does not give authority to deport any person from India—I will call attention to this particular Regulation presently—whether the explanation suggested by the motive of getting out of the difficulty this deportation landed the Government in is to be accepted, or whether the statement of the gentleman does not bear evidence of its truth and that the statement of the Indian Government is not true. As to the statement with regard to the way in which he was brought down to Bombay, he was twenty-six hours travelling from Assirgad. He says, "I was under a guard of eight police, hence the Government of India has paid all our rents of the railway and food." I would ask the House to consider the improbability of a man being sent back to England at his own wish under a guard of police. He says, "The new Commissioner of Bombay has informed me that he has received a telegram from the Viceroy that he should send me back to London." Will the right hon. gentleman deny that that is the case? Is this telegram in existence and, if so, will he produce it? This telegram from the Viceroy to the Police Commissioner in Bombay directing him to send Abdul Rasoul back to London. He goes on to say, "Then I replied to him in the presence of one of my companions, Khan-Saheli, that I am not going back to London by my own wish, because I have not any means for my living there. The man he refers to is capable of production, and I challenge the Government to produce him. Abdul therefore said distinctly when he was under this escort of police, he was not going to London at his own wish, but against it. He goes on to say, "In reply he said that the India Office of London knows very well all this matter and it will arrange for you any sufficient pension, whether from the said office or from 'Dhulip,' then he immediately sent me back to London with a passage of second class, from the office of the Commissioner to the port of Bombay under a guard of six police and one English officer with three carriages. The Government has paid all our rents for the said carriages, and from that port to the 'Assam' steamer we were carried by a steam-boat of the Government." He asks, "Hence how can you believe now that I came to London with my own wish?" I find, further, that Rasoul declares that his arrest when he arrived at Bombay "was because of communications received from the India Office by the Commissioner of Police at Bombay, so that the India Office knows all about the matter." I have asked the representative of the India Office in this House whether that is the case and I have been met with a denial of the fact. But then I want to question the Government in reference to the answer given by the right hon. gentleman this afternoon who intimates now for the first time only, after I have been harassing him with questions again and again, that it was in consequence of a

SUPPOSED TREASONABLE COMMUNICATION WITH DHULIP SINGH

that this gentleman was arrested. I ask the Government to state whether it is not the fact that Dhulip Singh was in Europe at that time? I have not heard that when Dhulip Singh issued the proclamation that is said to have been treasonable he was in India. I always understood that he was in Paris or some other part of the Continent. I ask the right hon. gentleman opposite whether, as a matter of fact, Dhulip Singh was not in Europe at that time; and if he was I ask the House to consider whether there is not at any rate a great deal of probability in the statement of Abdul Rasoul when he says that the orders came from this side to the Viceroy to arrest and imprison him and that therefore the statement made to me by the Government is not correct—that is to say the statement that they knew nothing about the matter, and could not do anything until they had communicated with the Viceroy as to the circumstances of the case. It will be found by those who may have followed this matter that in reply to the questions I have addressed to them from time to time, the Government have again and again objected to give me information on the ground that they were seeking information from India. I first mooted this question in the House on the 17th February, and as late as the 16th March I was being informed by the Government that they had no information because they had received none from the

Government of India. There is this curious discrepancy and contradiction in the answers which have been given to me by the Government. After telling me that Abdul Rasoul had been sent to London at his own request, they inform me that the Secretary of State was not in possession of information which enabled him to state the cause of complaint, or prefer any charge. In the same answer the right hon. gentleman, the member for Manchester, who represented the Under Secretary of State for India for the time, said the Government had offered to refund the expenses of Abdul Rasoul in this country since his arrival in November 1890, and that he had been offered a passage to Bombay with permission to return to Kashmir. Now, I want to know whether at the time that answer was given to me the Government knew the reason this gentleman had been arrested and imprisoned? If they had no information to give me as to the character of the suspicions against Abdul Rasoul, or the evidence upon which he was arrested I want to know why it is—how they can explain the anomaly of their conduct in offering this gentleman such compensation as would refund him his expenses in this country, and enable him to reach Bombay and Kashmir?

THE GOVERNMENT ARE IN THIS DIFFICULTY.

First of all, they tell us they have no evidence against the man, and know nothing of the reasons why the Viceroy thought it right to have him arrested, and they promise to give us the information, which promise they wait until to-night to carry out, and then at the same time they say, "We will send this gentleman back free of charge at the expense of the nation." But if the man was guilty of any offence at all we have a right to demand what character the accusation assumes. If he is guilty we have the right to say that the Government are not justified in sending him back to Kashmir and offering him a safe conduct. And if he is not criminal—and this is the chief ground of my complaint—there was no ground for his detention at all. I claim that the Government ought to go further and give him some kind of compensation for

THE ATROCIOUS ILL-TREATMENT HE HAS RECEIVED.

That is not all. It was not sufficient that this gentleman should thus be treated in India—insulted on his arrival at Bombay, taken up without a word of warning, imprisoned for nine months in India and then sent back in the charge of a *posse* of police against his will. That is not sufficient. When he comes to this country what happens? He applies to the India Office to be allowed to place his case before the authorities of the India Office. I would ask the House to observe that if the Government are correct in saying that he came to this country at his own request it was for the purpose of being able to prefer a charge against the Government and the police as regards his grievances before the supreme authorities at the India Office. Yet when he was brought here by the Government at his own request, and surely for no other purpose than to seek redress, how do they treat one of our fellow subjects in India when he has so serious a grievance to prefer against the Indian Government? This gentleman first of all waited upon Lord Cross at the India Office. I think the statement he made to me—for I have personally examined him and tested his veracity in every way—was that he waited three hours on one occasion at the India Office without seeing Lord Cross, and

HE WAS TREATED AS A BEGGAR OR A DOG,

and refused permission to see any of the authorities at the India Office. He then wrote a letter preferring his complaint and asking permission to expose his grievance. No notice was taken of that letter. Then he wrote a second letter, which was witnessed for him by a friend in London, and which he took the precaution of having registered and sent it to the India Office, that letter was also disregarded.

NOT A SINGLE SYLLABLE OF REPLY WAS VOUCHSAFED

to this poor Muhammadan fellow-subject of ours, and if it had not been for the fact that the matter was brought by me before this House at the instance of friends in London no more probably would have been heard of the matter, and nothing would have been done by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues at the India Office. In consequence of the questions I repeatedly put to him, the right hon. gentleman admitted that it was at the least uncivil that his Office did not take the trouble to reply to those letters. I say it was not only uncivil but positively unbusinesslike, and I want to know if this is the usual manner in which the business of the Office is conducted. It is a monstrous thing that because a man happens to be a Muhammadan and a native of Kashmir he should be treated like a dog when he has a solid grievance to bring before the Government of the country.

NO OTHER PERSON WOULD BE SO TREATED AS LONG AS HE WAS NOT A NATIVE OF INDIA

or some other foreign portion of Her Majesty's dominions. The Government seem to have got a little frightened at last when I pursued my inquiries in this House, and so I find that on the 24th of February Abdul Rasoul was requested to go to the India Office and see one of the officials. He saw Sir Gerald Fitzgerald, who offered him £10 for maintenance, and said: "I suppose you are willing to go back to India." I want to point out that at this time the Government were informing me in this House that they knew nothing of the circumstances of the case and were waiting for information from India. The right hon. gentleman (Sir J. Gorst) shakes his head, but the official reply in the pages of "Hansard" prove that it was so. The interview to which I refer took place at the India Office before the 24th of February. On the 9th of March I got this answer from the Government: "Abdul Rasoul was offered the refund of his expenses since arrival in November, 1890, a passage to Bombay, and permission to return to Kashmir. He was sent to London at his own request. If Abdul Rasoul demands compensation he should address himself in the first instance to the Government of India, and, in the event of their refusing him redress, appeal to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State is not in possession of information which enables him to state the cause of complaint or prefer any charge."

Sir JOHN GORST: What I said in reply to the first question was that the Government could take no step until they received information from India. Two days after that, the information came that the Government of India paid the passage of this man to London. Immediately after that, we offered to pay his passage back again.

Mr. CONYBEARE: That is all very well, but the question I have been hammering at and could get no answer from the Government to, was as to the guilt or innocence of this man. Why should this man

BE TREATED IN THIS INFAMOUS WAY

and then be sent back in this hugger-mugger fashion in order to shut the matter up in this House? Why should he be sent back before we were informed whether he was guilty or not? The information I asked for in the first place I tried to obtain again and again, and only to-day for the first time have I been able to get a clear answer. It was: What was the cause of complaint, if any, against this gentleman? At the time the right hon. gentleman gave me the answer I have read he had not received, or, if he had received, took very good care not to tell me, the cause of complaint against this gentleman. His words are:—"The Secretary of State is not in possession of information which enables him to state the cause of complaint or prefer any charge." Yet, without knowing whether this man was guilty or not, they offered to pay his debts in this country and to send him back to India free of expense. I say if the man was innocent he had no business to be treated in that way.

IF HE WAS NOT INNOCENT HE OUGHT TO HAVE BEEN BROUGHT TO JUSTICE;

and in any case we have a right to know definitely what was the charge the Government were prepared to bring against him, and whether they have now become convinced that there was no ground whatever for that charge. It is not a charge really, but merely a matter of suspicion. The right hon. gentleman says the Government had reason to believe or suspect Abdul Rasoul was in communication with Dhulip Singh, who had issued a treasonable proclamation.

A MORE HUMBUGGING WAY OF DEALING

with one of Her Majesty's subjects I never heard of. If the Government had any solid ground for suspecting that there was any treasonable communication between this man and Dhulip Singh I say we have a right to know exactly whether they have come to the conclusion or not that the man was not guilty of any such treasonable practice as they thought he might be guilty of at the time of his arrest. But the importance of that is this. If this gentleman was kipnapped and imprisoned for nine months without a single charge or accusation being brought against him, and if the Government now—and they have by their action in offering him money and offering to send him back to Kashmir—if the Government admit that there was no ground for the accusation against him, if he was not guilty of the matters of which he was suspected, have we no right to demand that this unfortunate man should have something in the way of compensation? They say "We won't consider the question of compensation." I have a letter from the India Office saying "We will simply pay your debts within certain limits; we will pay your passage to Bombay and give you a safe conduct to Kashmir," and in the event of his refusing these terms, in the event of his pressing for something in the shape of compensation for these grievous wrongs which the action of the Government showed that they believed to exist, and were not justified by reason of there being no guilt attaching to him at all, they say they will have nothing more to do with him. Now, I do not know that it is of any use pressing the right hon. gentleman further on this question of compensation. But the House and the country will realise what this state of things is—that a man may be kidnapped and imprisoned in this way upon the barest suspicion and treated with all sorts of indignity and brought against his will under police escort to this country, and then the Government by their action admit that there was nothing against him whatever, that he was an innocent man, and when he asks for some compensation and redress of his wrongs he is thrown back on what I venture to call

A VERY ILLUSIONARY PROMISE OR STATEMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT.

They said the right persons to apply to are the Government of India. I should like to know what sort of redress this man would get from the Viceroy. How is he to proceed I should like to know? In India he would have no chance whatever of getting any compensation. Is there any court in India before which this gentleman could bring his complaint against the Viceroy? Could he in any way attach the Viceroy in the Courts with a view to obtaining any redress? Probably the only answer he would get if he were to bring this matter before any court in India would be to be told, "This is not a matter that concerns us. We derive our instructions and our information from London, and you must go to Lord Cross, who is the supreme authority in this matter, to whom these demands should be, in the first place, made." That is a style of playing at battledoor and shuttlecock with the rights of our Indian fellow-subjects, which is disgraceful, and it would be a novelty to most members to find that such a thing could be possible at all. Therefore I must again press the Government to reconsider their position in this matter. I think I have shown, and it must be clear to everybody, first that

THIS MAN HAS BEEN WRONGED,

and, secondly, that the Government know they were wrong, that they have dealt unjustly by him, and I want the House to realise the effect upon the minds of our Indian fellow-subjects of such treatment. It is all very well to treat this matter as a matter affecting one individual. The effect of an incident of this kind will be far reaching. It will permeate through every corner of India, and quite right that it should. And, then, what effect do you suppose it will have upon the feelings of loyalty towards this country on the part of the people of India? How can you expect that the people of India will be satisfied with the paternal despotism which we are always boasting of in India when they find that Europeans go scot free, that the fact of a man being a European is enough to prevent his being touched under these old-fashioned regulations, while any unfortunate Indian may not only be detained in the way this gentleman was, but may have all his possessions and lands attached and taken from him as well. I will just refer for one moment to the regulations under which this matter has taken place, and I want to draw attention to them for this reason. In the question I asked this afternoon the right hon. gentleman

WAS FORCED TO ADMIT THAT HIS PREVIOUS ANSWER TO ME WAS WRONG.

When he said this gentleman was arrested under regulation 3 of

1818. And it shows how little the right hon. gentleman knows about this matter himself. There are several regulations and regulation 3 of 1818 applies solely to Bengal. The Government had no more power to deal with this gentleman under Regulation 3 of 1818, than they had to deal with him under the Habeas Corpus Act which unfortunately does not affect India in the smallest degree. The regulation which the Government did act under was the regulation passed in 1827, No. 25. The Regulation 3 of 1818 applies solely to Bengal, this regulation of 1827 applies solely to Bombay. This is the one under which this incident has taken place, and the preamble of this regulation states that whereas reasons of State embracing the due maintenance of alliances formed by the British Government with foreign powers, the preservation of tranquillity in native territority and the security of British dominion from foreign hostility and internal commotion, occasionally render it necessary to place under restraint individuals against whom there may not be sufficient ground for instituting any judicial proceedings, or when such proceedings might not be adapted to the nature of the case, or may from other reasons be inadvisable and imprudent, then the following rules shall be enacted; and then the regulation enables the Government to arrest and detain any Indian gentleman whom they may suspect, and so on. That is chapter one of this regulation. The second chapter contains rules for the attachment of lands for reasons of State, and for the removing of such attachments. Therefore you have by the two classes of regulations, which are no doubt very similar in both territories—Bengal and Bombay—first of all enables the Government on the barest suspicion or for no reason at all, to arrest and imprison an Indian gentleman, and secondly, to deprive him of his property and his estates. I want to ask the right hon. gentleman upon that point whether it is not the case that these regulations apply solely to Indians, and whether it would be possible to attach any European subject under these regulations. If I am not mis-informed these regulations are strictly limited to natives of India, and I want to know why, at the present time, should such a regulation as that be maintained with this odious distinction between the English governors of the country, and our Indian fellow-subjects, considering that it might not be inconceivable that European emissaries might also, if there is any ground for supposing that Indian emissaries do—might also create disturbances and disaffection. Now, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I have made this matter perfectly clear. As I have said before, I have brought this matter forward because I believe that it will be

A PERFECTLY NEW THING TO MOST PEOPLE

that this regulation exists. I repeat that those regulations under which the Government acts are old fashioned regulations belonging to the year 1818 and 1827, when the circumstances were totally different to what they are at the present time. I venture to think that most people will agree with me that whatever may be done in this particular case of Abdul Rasoul, it is quite time that these regulations should in the interests of good government in India be abrogated, or at all events no longer acted upon. I cannot conceive any kind of regulations so calculated to destroy confidence in the justice of our rule in India than the maintenance and exercise of regulations such as those which I have brought under the notice of this House. There is another point I want to address the Government upon before I resume my seat. It has reference to a question which I have asked several times, as to the number of persons who have been imprisoned under this regulation. I asked in the first place for the names and number of the persons so imprisoned, but the right hon. gentleman said it would be prejudicial to the interests of the country to give such particulars. But there can be nothing prejudicial to the interests of the country in giving the number of the persons over a series of years who have been thus treated. We want to know how these extraordinary regulations have been put in force. I again ask the right hon. gentleman why he objects to give a return shewing the number of persons, who since 1818, who have been deprived either of their lands or their liberty. I thank the House for having allowed me to bring the matter forward and I hope I shall not be considered as having unduly trespassed upon the time of the House, having regard to the magnitude of the subject. I hope the right hon. gentleman will be able to give us some satisfactory assurance on the point. If not, I am afraid we will have to avail ourselves of the attraction of the rule by putting down an amendment to the motion to go into Committee on the Indian Budget, for the purpose of further discussing this matter.

Sir J. GORST (Under Secretary for India): Mr. Speaker, I hope in a very few words to be able to assure the House that my noble friend the Secretary for India is desirous not only of treating this unfortunate man with justice, but with kindness and generosity. There are four matters which the hon. member for Camborne has dealt with in his motion for the adjournment of the House, and I may be permitted to say that he has rather mixed them together, but I will endeavour to keep them distinct. The first question is whether this Abdul Rasoul was properly arrested and put in prison by the Government of India. The second is the question whether he was deported or not to this country. The third is the question what is to be done with Abdul Rasoul, now he is in the country. And the fourth is the claim of Abdul Rasoul for compensation for imprisonment—which the hon. member has rather mixed up with the other points. I shall take each of these four points separately, and deal with them frankly to the House. The first question is,

WAS THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA JUSTIFIED IN ARRESTING AND IMPRISONING ABDUL RASOUL

in India? That is a question which if this House wishes to discuss it, it is not yet in a position to do so. Because I have repeatedly stated to the hon. and learned member, in answer to his question, that we are not in possession of the information which will enable the Secretary of State himself to judge whether the Government of India has exercised wisely or not the discretion entrusted to it, in the arrest of Abdul Rasoul. Now, the hon. member has found great fault with the existence of this arbitrary and despotic power or regulation in India. That is a large question which this House might discuss if it is disposed to do so. But

INDIA IS A DESPOTIC COUNTRY; IT IS NOT A FREE COUNTRY;

it is a country which is governed by

A VERY ARBITRARY AND A VERY STRONG DESPOTISM,

and this regulation of the Queen, Regulation 25, to which the hon. member refers, is

ONE OF THOSE POWERS WHICH

are put into the hands of arbitrary Governments, and which if the Government is to be despotic and arbitrary

MUST BE EXERCISED FROM TIME TO TIME.

The hon. member asks me whether this Regulation is applied only to Indians and not to Europeans. It applies to everybody who goes to Bombay. If the hon. member for Camborne were to go into the Province of Bombay, and were suspected of acting in a manner which was likely to interfere with the security of the British dominions from foreign hostility, it would be the duty of the Viceroy of India to arrest the hon. member, and to detain him for such time as would prevent him from carrying out his nefarious intentions. The hon. member says he has experienced great difficulty in drawing from me the reason of the arrest of Abdul Rasoul. I have it dragged from me with great reluctance, and it is the hon. member for Camborne, and not the noble lord the Secretary of State, or myself who is responsible. During the last two years, I have been most anxious not to state the reason. This man having made his submission to Her Majesty, I was most reluctant to make up those matters which most of them should be forgotten. But the hon. member by his reiterated questions has compelled my noble friend to tell the House the reason why this man was arrested. He was arrested because the Government of India

HAD REASON TO BELIEVE THAT THIS SHEIKH WAS AN EMISSARY OF THE MAHARAJAH DHULIP SINGH,

and arrived in India for the purpose of stirring up dissension and commotion in our Indian Empire.

Mr. CONYBEARE: On what evidence?

Sir J. GORST: I refer the hon. member to the Regulation, which places the discretion in the hands of the Government of India. It says that "when the considerations stated in the preamble of this Regulation require it, the Governor in Council has power, &c." What evidence has the hon. member that the Governor in Council has exercised his power unwisely or corruptly in this matter? Is the House of Commons going to act on no papers whatever, without any information whatever, and merely upon the *ipse dixit* of the hon. member for Camborne? Is it, in the absence of the necessary material, going to discuss whether the Government of India have exercised the very great power conferred upon it by statute, with proper discretion or not? If the House of Commons wishes to discuss it, if any hon. member raises a motion on the subject, and gets time for it, and if information be received from India, of course it will be my duty to defend the Government of India in this House. But I strongly appeal to this House not to discuss any matter of the kind, unless it has some *primâ facie* evidence brought forward to shew that the Government of India was animated by some personal or corrupt motive. I defy the House to leave the discretion where the law has put it, with the Governor of India, and then to discuss whether any attempt to enforce it had been properly made or not, in the absence of information. Abdul Rasoul was arrested according to law; the arrest was made on the responsibility of the Government of India; and we have no means at present of knowing whether the discretion of the Government of India was rightly or wrongly exercised. With regard to the second question,

WAS HE DEPORTED?

The hon. member has used the word deported in order to show that the man was sent to London against his will, whereas he was sent at his own request, and was not deported. Fortunately, by a piece of very good fortune, there has been transmitted from India a copy of the petition which was presented from the Shiekh Abdul Rasoul, to Mr. Mackenzie, Chief Commissioner, for his release. This is a remarkable document, and it disproves so entirely of the ingenious conjectures of the hon. member for Camborne, that the House will permit me to read it:—"I take the liberty of craving your gracious attention to my following poor petition. In short, his Highness Maharaja Dhulip Singh, who is my old friend and master, has received pardon of her Most Gracious Majesty, the Empress of India. I also lay before your honour my humble petition, that you will be pleased to solicit my release. If I should be released, I give my most solemn understanding that I will in no way in future do or join in anything against the Government of her Most Gracious Majesty. If I should be graciously released, I will request the permission to return to my native place, Srinigar in Kashmir. On the other hand, if the Government shall not accept my return to Kashmir, then I request to be sent back to England. I am without funds or means of paying my passage, or any means of support. His Highness, the Maharaja Dhulip Singh would supply the necessary funds for my passage to England, and for my future a sufficient year's salary." The hon. member for Camborne spoke of the cruelty of the Government of India in landing a man at London Docks without a penny for his support. He came to London, and the Government of India had reason to suppose that if he got back to London his Highness the Maharaja Dhulip Singh would support him, so they sent him. On arrival Abdul Rasoul did not go to his old friend and master Dhulip Singh, but he went to the hon. member for Camborne, who has treated him ever since, valiantly and disinterestedly, as having a grievance. That leads me to the third point, viz:

WHAT IS TO BE DONE WITH THIS MAN.

Well, as the hon. member for Camborne himself admits, there was this unfortunate man over here in London without a penny to call his own, dying to get back to his native home at Srinigar in Kashmir, from which he had been absent for a period of thirty-five years. Taking him at his word my noble friend the Secretary of State said to the man, "If you desire it I will pay your passage back to India, and the debts you have contracted in London, and I will also guarantee that the Government of India shall not arrest you when you get there, but that you shall be permitted to go to your native home at Srinigar." But the moment this was said the man turned completely round. I do not know whether it was at the instigation of the hon. gentleman, the member for Camborne, but at any rate he said, "I

will not go without compensation." Matters were thus brought to a deadlock.

Mr. CONYBEARE: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not make any such suggestion.

Sir J. GORST: The hon. gentleman may take it that that remark was merely in the nature of a flower of rhetoric. At all events we have the fact that this man Abdul Rasoul was here in London expressing the desire to get back to his native place, and that when made acquainted with that fact the Secretary of State was ready and willing to pay his fare home, and that the moment this offer was made to him the man refused to go because he wanted to get compensation and thought he might be able to get it through the medium of the hon. gentleman the member for Camborne and the House of Commons. Now, sir, it has been said that the offer made by the Secretary of State to carry him back to Kashmir was a proof that my noble friend knew that that man had not been justly treated. I reply that it was nothing of the kind. The fact is that the Secretary of State has the most perfect confidence in the discretion of the Government of India when they found that the Government of India

WERE OF OPINION THAT THIS MAN WAS A DANGER TO THE PEACE OF INDIA.

The Secretary of State had no doubt that the discretion of the Government of India had been very properly exercised.

Mr. CONYBEARE: What was the evidence?

Sir J. GORST: I decline to state. I have not got the evidence here and if I had I should certainly decline to state it unless I were called upon by an overwhelming majority of the members of this House to do so: I believe however that the majority of members in this House are so inspired with good sense that they would not ask for that evidence unless they believed that it was of a character which it was absolutely necessary to produce. With regard to

THE QUESTION OF COMPENSATION

that has been raised in this case I may say at once that that claim is not one which I have shown the slightest desire or inclination to shirk. All I can say upon that subject is that

IF IT IS BROUGHT FORWARD IN A PROPER MANNER IT SHALL BE FREELY CONSIDERED.

But the proper course to take would be in the first instance to bring the claim before the Government of India, who are acquainted with all the facts of the case. Abdul Rasoul must petition the Government of India for compensation and put forward in support of his claim the grounds of injustice upon which he founds it, and if a full consideration of all the circumstances the Government of India should refuse his request, he will then have a right to appeal to the Secretary of State, by whom I may say in answer to the rhetoric of the hon. gentleman the member of Camborne would be fully and fairly considered. This is what the man has to do if he wants compensation. There is no such thing as getting compensation from the India Office. We can only give a man compensation on an appeal from the Government of India. The hon. member for Camborne is derisive on this point, but I would remind him that you do not allow a man to go direct to the House of Lords; you only go there by way of appeal. In the same way you cannot allow a man to apply for compensation directly to the Secretary of State. He must, in the first instance have submitted his case to those who are acquainted with the circumstances. I have now dealt with the case as it has been brought before the House as shortly as I could consistently with the real circumstances, and I hope I have said sufficient to convince this House that the Secretary of State is desirous of doing everything he possibly can that is

NOT ONLY FAIR BUT EVEN GENEROUS

in this matter; that there is no wish on his part or on the part of the Government of India to oppress or persecute Abdul Rasoul, and that if that person had only placed himself in the hands of good advisers instead of his case being now made the occasion for a motion for the adjournment of the House and used for Parliamentary purposes of this country—if this native had been recommended to take the offer made by the Secretary of State and gone back to India he would have been very much happier and better off than he is likely to be while he remains in the hands of his present advisers.

Mr. MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I am sure, sir, that hon. members on both sides of the House are very glad to see the right hon. gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India back again in his place in better health and vigour, and having said so much in reference to the right hon. gentleman himself I now have in my place in Parliament to make a serious complaint against the Indian Government. Their conduct is in point of fact so bad that Irish officials are becoming respectable by comparison. Now, sir, about 130 years ago—(laughter). Hon. gentlemen do not seem to be very fond of ancient history, but I wish to remind them that about 130 years ago the elder Pitt got up in the House of Commons and said "The iniquities of Indian administration are so rife that they smell from earth to heaven and from heaven to earth again." Well, sir, what have we here. We have before us the case of a poor poverty-stricken and a defenceless man. We have that man, by the confession of the Indian Government themselves, arrested on no charge whatever, and not only on no charge but also on no warrant. He is then kept in gaol for a period of nine months without the shadow of a pretence or any excuse except the mere suspicion which has been communicated to the Indian Government. Let us compare the position of this man to that of the noble lord the Secretary for India. Lord Cross receives a handsome salary from this country, whereas the average income of an ordinary native of India is something like three-halfpence a day. Against this three-halfpence Lord Cross is in receipt of £5,000 a year. When this poor wretched poverty-stricken man goes to Lord Cross and states his case and the reasons which induces him to bring it forward Lord Cross turns him with contumely from his door. Let us again consider by way of contrast and comparison the amount of personal liberty which is revealed by this transaction as possessed by the natives of India. Why, sir, if this kind of thing is to go on

A MAN MIGHT AS WELL BE IN IRELAND AS IN INDIA.

Even the right hon. gentleman the Under Secretary for India is compelled to admit that that great bulwark of liberty of the subject the *Habeas Corpus* has no operation in India. No doubt it is a pleasant confession to hon. members opposite that there is no *Habeas Corpus* Act in India. But let me turn to the facts of this case. For nine months this man was kept in gaol without a warrant and without a charge being preferred. Had he been in England he could have demanded to be brought up under the *Habeas Corpus* Act. According to his own account that man has been deported from his own country to a country where he was perfectly friendless and where he had no means of support. Why, I ask, will not the right hon. gentleman the Under Secretary for India lay the evidence in this case before the House? If India is to be retained under the British flag and the British constitution, why should not the House of Commons, having regard to the interests of the 250,000,000 of people over whom this country exercises rule, have the return they asked for laid upon the table so that the hon. members might be able to go into the question and form their own judgment upon it. Why, I ask, should not the people of India have afforded to them the same comforts and consolations that are afforded to every oppressed man who has the knowledge that his grievance will be justly and properly investigated and that injustice will be exposed before the British public. The right hon. gentleman has referred at great length to the Regulations of 1827 having been endorsed by Parliament. No doubt that is so, but I would point out to the House that these regulations were made thirty years before the East India Company was disestablished and that they were made by a Board of Control which was practically outside the control of the House of Commons. There was undoubtedly a revision of those Regulations every twenty years, but that after all was merely a formal matter, and even though they were endorsed by the House of Commons of 1828, that House was differently composed to the present House of Commons. If the right hon. gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs should think it necessary to speak on this question, he may tell me that those Regulations were Bombay Regulations, and that the right hon. gentleman the Under Secretary for India whose administration, I admit, is marked with great ability, is not in Bombay. But I would ask the right hon. gentleman the Foreign Under Secretary whether he will get up and say he ever knew of a single case in which a European was arrested under such circumstances and by the exercise of such powers as these. It may seem a strange term to use if I speak of "bullying the natives", but, sir, I do use that phrase, and I find it has been used by no less a person than Lord Lytton when holding the high office of Governor-General of India. Lord Lytton is reported to have said in a despatch—and the statement has never been denied—that he as Governor-General had only two courses to pursue, to cheat them or to bully them, and he preferred to cheat them.

WILL LORD LYTTON DENY THAT HE SAID THIS?

The question may be put to him by telegraph in Paris to-morrow and an answer can easily be obtained if the Government wish to obtain it. Now here is a case in which a man has been absolutely bullied, and only on suspicion of having taken part with Dhulip Singh; but when Dhulip Singh has been forgiven for his part in what took place, his alleged accomplice is kept in prison many months after the principal has been released. The right hon. gentleman commented upon the document the man wrote. It must be remembered Abdul Rasoul had been imprisoned many months when he wrote the document; and that people who are imprisoned and who suffer keenly will do almost anything to secure release. I certainly hope my hon. friend will press his motion to a division. It ought to be pressed to a division if this were only a case involving the liberty of this poor man. I agree with what was once said by a great countryman of my own—Edmund Burke—with reference to India: he said he hoped the time would come when the personal liberty of the subject would be as respected and as secure in the heart of our Indian possessions as it was in the Strand in the City of London. We govern the people of India and impose on them burdens that we have not ourselves. Mr. Bright once said that the Government of India was a pure despotism. Do we work that despotism for the good of the people or for our own gain? Her Majesty's Government had tried for four months to suppress this case, and therefore it is, I trust, my hon. friend will go to a division. I know very well he will be abused to-morrow morning in the Tory papers, but he will have the satisfaction that what he has said and what I have said will be read by those by whom we most wish it to be read, namely, by the native populations of India.

Mr. W. M'ARTHUR (St. Austell, Cornwall): Had time permitted I should have found it necessary to differ very widely indeed from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down; but I want to make a few remarks with reference to what fell from the Under Secretary of State for India. We are not used to hearing from him flowers of rhetoric but are accustomed to the solid fodder he is in the habit of giving us in reply to questions and motions. I am bound to say I think that on the whole the Under Secretary made out a fairly reasonable case except in one particular, to which I wish to address my observations. I have always been one of those people who, having seen something of subject races, appreciate the great difficulty English people have in dealing with them. I think if there is anything about which this House ought to be most careful it is in passing votes of indiscriminate censure against the action of Englishmen, who very often do their duty under circumstances of very great difficulty. (Hear, hear.) As I say I don't altogether sympathise with the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. MacNeill) after the speech of the Under Secretary. But I think

A GREAT DEAL OF HARM IS DONE ABROAD

and very wrong impression often conveyed of Englishmen in authority abroad by the kind of defence their action receives in this House from responsible ministers. I do not say whether this man was right or wrong. I do not intend to argue whether the Regulations are right or wrong: I am inclined to think they are right. I think it is necessary to make this kind of Regulation in India. But it is unfortunate that the right hon. gentleman should have chaffed my hon. friend the member for Camborne (Mr. Conybeare) because he called attention to the case of a native in India who, he thought, had been unfairly treated. If there is anything which can excuse a motion for the adjournment of the House it is surely the case of some supposed injustice to a native subject of the Queen because, what does our great empire abroad rest upon? No one will say we can maintain our empire simply by the number of soldiers we have got. We maintain it in India, as we maintain it elsewhere, because this country has always been able to

convince coloured races that in the main our rule is a fair and just rule, and that as far as the English people can provide and as far as the House of Commons can provide

EVERY NATIVE

wherever he lives

WILL GET AS FAIR TREATMENT FROM ENGLISH OFFICIALS AS HE WOULD IF HE WERE AN ENGLISHMAN.

But if you are going to scoff at everybody who calls attention to a case of injustice, if you are going to protest against giving the House of Commons any information on these subjects, it seems to me you are going the best way to convince every native in India and throughout the world that you have got something to conceal, and you are afraid to explain. I put it to the Under Secretary whether he would not have saved a great deal of time by giving us a frank and straightforward answer when he was first asked for information. I assure the right hon. gentleman that there is no desire on the part of hon. members who put questions on Indian and Colonial matters to be regarded as opposed to him. We ask questions because we are anxious for information, and I don't think it ought to be thought that we asked them for the purpose of damaging the Government or of making party capital. Indian and Colonial questions are not party questions and when we on this side interrogate the Under Secretary,

WE DONT WANT FLOWERS OF RHETORIC FROM HIM

but frank and plain answers. If he gives us such answers he may rest assured we shall not make party capital out of them, but feel satisfied that justice has been done.

Motion for adjournment, negatived.

April 17.

THE AGRICULTURE OF INDIA.

Mr. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether the Secretary of State for India has received a report from Mr. J. Augustus Voelcker, Ph.D., B.A., B.Sc., recently deputed to inquire into and report upon the agriculture of India, containing his main conclusions and recommendations concerning the improvement of Indian agriculture, more particularly such improvement as might result from the teachings of science:

And, when the Secretary of State expects to be able to make Dr. Voelcker's report public.

The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA: We expect to receive the full report of Dr. Voelcker in the autumn, and the Secretary of State does not anticipate that there will be any difficulty in making it public.

Mr. SCHWANN: After it has been received how long will it be before it is made public?

Sir J. GORST: If the hon. member will move for it after it has been presented I have no doubt that I shall be enabled to give it at once.

MANIPUR.

Colonel NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, if his attention has been drawn to the statement in Thursday's *Times*, that all villages in Manipur which offer resistance are to be burned:

If the Secretary of State for India will enjoin on commanders of columns that no village shall be burned for offering resistance unaccompanied by cruelty to wounded or to prisoners, or by treachery on the part of that particular village:

And, if it is the custom, in waging war in the Frontier States of India, to depart from the usual customs of civilised war without the personal sanction of the Empress of India.

Sir J. GORST: I believe that the Secretary of State has not received any corroboration of the statement in the *Times* that all villages in Manipur which offer resistance are to be burned. He has the fullest confidence that the Government of India will, in any proclamation they may issue, act with due regard to those principles of justice and mercy which have always been observed in Indian frontier wars.

Col. NOLAN: May I ask the right hon. gentleman to be more explicit? Is he prepared to deny the statement shortly and officially given in the *Times* is founded on fact, and if so is he going to leave it to chance whether villages may be burned or not? Will the Government give orders that villages are not to be burned unless there is an absolute necessity for so extreme a course?

Sir J. GORST: The Secretary of State will not assume that the Government of India will act with impropriety, and therefore there is no necessity to direct them to act properly. He will assume that they will act properly unless there is direct evidence that they have not done so.

Col. NOLAN: Will the Under Secretary explain whether a British column will be allowed to act differently in this war from the way in which a German column would act in a European war. Is he not of opinion that that would be improper?

Sir J. GORST: Certainly, sir.

Mr. E. ROBERTSON (Dundee): Is it the fact that the troops put to death women and children?

Sir. J. GORST: I have seen such a statement in the newspapers, but there is no official information of the kind.

REDUCTION OF RATES ON INDIAN AND COLONIAL POSTAGE.

Mr. SUMMERS (Huddersfield): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, what was the estimated loss to the revenue that was due to the reduction in the rates of the Indian and Colonial postage during that portion of the last financial year during which the reduced rates were in operation?

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. Goschen, St. George's, Hanover Square): I believe it was £25,000.

Mr. SUMMERS: I beg to ask the Postmaster General, what would be the additional loss to the revenue if the postage rate to India and the Colonies were reduced from 2½d. to 1d.

And if he can explain to the House the basis on which his estimate is framed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes, University of Cambridge): Besides a loss of revenue to the extent of £105,000 a year already incurred in consequence of reducing the postage of letters to India and the Colonies to 2½d., it is estimated that an immediate additional loss of £75,000 a year would result from a reduction from 2½d. to 1d. This estimate is based on the amount of correspondence which passes between this country and India, and the Colonies, and it is shown by the latest returns and official records. It is not however possible to estimate the contingent loss that might arise from any considerable increase of correspondence.

Mr. SUMMERS: May I ask the right hon. gentleman whether in this calculation he estimates the cost of sending each letter from London to Dover at 1d.?

Mr. RAIKES: The estimate has been based on a comparison from the revenue derived from a 2½d. postage and a reduction to 1d.

THE EXPEDITION TO MANIPUR.

Mr. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether he has yet received information as to the alleged statement that the troops employed in the Manipur expedition were at the time of the recent disaster without an adequate or suitable supply of reserve ammunition to fit their rifles:

And, whether, if he has no knowledge as yet on the subject, he will telegraph to India for such information.

The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Sir J. Gorst, Chatham): I presume that the hon. gentleman cannot have received a communication which I forwarded to him this afternoon asking him to postpone this question until I can receive information from India.

Mr. WEBSTER: No, sir, I did not receive a communication from the right hon. gentleman, and, of course, I will defer the question.

Mr. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, whether he has now obtained any official reply as to the truth or falsehood of the rumours which have appeared in the press, that Indian troops killed Manipuri women and children in the affair at Manipur, so that, in case the rumour be proved false, it may be categorically denied.

Sir J. GORST: The noble lord the Secretary of State for India has information from Manipur which denies by implication the statement which is contained in the question, but he has deemed it proper to address a telegram to Manipur on the subject, and I must ask the hon. member to postpone his question until the answer to that inquiry has been received.

THE BOMBAY CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (Londonderry): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether it is true that a grave "block" still exists in the Bombay Civil Service, that nearly one-third of the whole service is crowded into the four years preceding 1871, and that, although the "block" has been officially acknowledged, nothing has been done by the Government of India, or the Secretary of State, towards removing it:

And, why have no "blocked" Bombay civilians been employed under the Government of India.

Sir J. GORST: No doubt, promotion in the year named in the question of the hon. gentleman has been slow; but steps have been taken by the grant of what are called "minimum allowances" to meet cases of exceptional hardship. It is not the case that Bombay men of the years named have not been employed under the Government of India.

THE OPIUM DEBATE.

Mr. MACLEAN (Oldham): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether, considering the anxiety caused in India by the Division of last Friday week, and the necessity for letting the Indian Government know what are the real intentions of the House of Commons with regard to the Opium Revenue, he will give a day for the discussion of the main question raised in the resolution of the hon. baronet, the member for the Barnard Castle Division of Durham, Sir J. Pease, and of the amendment proposed by the right hon. baronet the member for the City of London, Sir R. Fowler.

The FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. Smith, Strand): I regret that the amendment of the right hon. baronet the member for the City of London, did not form part of the main question moved by the hon. baronet the member for the Barnard Castle division, but I cannot see at present any prospect of being able to find time for a renewal of the discussion in order that a definite decision on the whole question can be arrived at.

Mr. MACLEAN: In the meantime will the Government refrain from communicating to the Government of India the imperfect proceedings of the House or our intention to take any action on what the House has done?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I think the hon. member is well aware of the principles on which the Government of India is conducted. The Government of India is responsible for the financial arrangements of India, and it would be improper if I were to suggest that they will not consider what passes within this House. They are not however, responsible to this House. The full and entire responsibility of the Government of India rests upon themselves.

Sir J. PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle): Perhaps I may be allowed to say that it is not my intention to ballot in order to place the motion again as a substantive motion before the House. I feel that at this time of the Session it would be inconvenient to the House again to introduce the subject even if I were so minded. Moreover I am advised that if I were to do so the motion of my right hon. friend the member for the City of London might be deemed by you, sir, to be out of order, as it involves a question of handing money by this House over to the Indian Government without the consent of the Crown. In looking at that matter myself, and the view of the authorities, it seems to me that the point might arise although I believe there has been no absolute ruling in regard to it. On the other hand, I am quite content for the present with the declaration which has been made by the right hon. gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury that the policy of Her Majesty's Government has been

in the past a steady reduction of the quantity of land in India placed under poppy cultivation, and that that policy will be persevered with in future. I am also content with the declaration which was made by my right hon. friend the Under Secretary of State. Under these circumstances I do not propose to raise the subject again this Session.

Mr. HUGH ELLIOT (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether, having regard to the conflicting statements made as to the effects produced upon health by the consumption of Indian opium in China and elsewhere, to the confusion which it is alleged exists in the public mind upon this matter, and to the insufficient time which a discussion on a private member's motion affords for an exhaustive debate, he will consent to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the allegations made on either side, with a view of testing their accuracy, and enabling the House and Country to form an instructed judgment as to their worth.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: No doubt there have been conflicting statements made as to the effects produced upon health by the consumption of Indian opium in China and elsewhere, but I do not think that the appointment of a Select Committee would enable the House to judge of the accuracy or otherwise of the allegations which have been made or to form a judgment which would be of very great value.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE LAST CONGRESS.

(From the Introduction to the Report.)

This year the Congress was a very small one; last year the Congress, by a special resolution, restricted the number of delegates to be elected this year to five per million of the population (199 millions) represented. Rather more, however, than 1,000 (the proper number was 995) were elected, but only 702 actually attended, of whom only 677 were properly registered under the special certificates now required. The three hundred odd elected delegates who failed to appear were deterred, some, as in the casa of Sindh (the only district that did not send a single delegate), by the great expense and great length of the journey; by sickness, and, in three cases, death; by the death of relatives, and the consequent inability (in the case of Hindus) to participate in public business, and by pressing personal business. Next year different arrangements will be made, by electing subsidiary delegates to insure the attendance of the full 1,000, but this year the gathering itself was not much larger than a very full House of Commons, which has, we believe, on one occasion, mustered 650. On the other hand, the number of spectators, though all had to pay for admission, exceeded that at any previous Congress, more than 7,000 being present on the first day, and the number never falling, at any time, below 4,000. Indeed, a very large number of these latter came from other provinces, and would have been delegates had our last year's rule not been strictly enforced.

Of the 677 registered delegates 505 were Hindus, 116 (or rather over 17 per cent., against 18 per cent. at Allahabad, and 13½ per cent. at Bombay last year) were Mussalmans, three Jains, seven Parsis, three Sikhs, eighteen Brahmos, fifteen Native, one Armenian, and seven European, Christians.

As regards occupations some 250 were zemindars, talukdars, landholders of various kinds, and cultivators; some thirty were bankers; seventy merchants and traders; nearly 300 barristers, advocates, solicitors, pleaders and mukhtears; forty-one principals, professors, and masters of colleges and schools; the same number of journalists and newspaper proprietors; thirty-one medical men; six engineers, a few mill owners, contractors, indigo, and tea-planters, etc.; and sixteen missionaries and religious teachers of various creeds.

More than two hundred of these gentlemen were chairmen, vice-chairmen, or members of District and Local Boards or Municipalities; showing that, despite the widespread, though not universal, local official opposition to, and discountenance of, Lord Ripon's noble scheme of local self-government, these bodies do yet manage to secure the services of a considerable number of our most enlightened citizens; nearly one hundred were honorary magistrates, a position akin to that of Justices of the Peace in England, further confirming what Lord Lansdowne's letter has gone far to establish, viz., that, however great the hostilities of certain sections of the rank and file of the service, the more enlightened officials have no wish, actually, to boycott the Congress party.

There were several members of the Viceroy's and other Legislative Councils, many Fellows of Universities, ten Nawabs, two or three Rajahs, and so forth. This year only 160 were graduates, against 250 last year, but then they were 160 out of 677, or over 23 per cent. against 250 out of 1889, which is less than 14 per cent. On the whole, law and the learned professions mustered more strongly, proportionally, than at Bombay, and the mercantile classes markedly less strongly, and this was only what might have been expected, seeing that this year, Bengal, alone, sent its full quota, while last year the majority ef the delegates were from Bombay and Madras.

"India."—Last night, under the auspices of the Trent Ward Liberal Association, a lecture on this subject was delivered by Mr. A. Lord at the Red Lion Inn, Manvers Street, to a considerable audience. Mr. James Hooper occupied the chair, and was supported by the following gentlemen: Councillor J. Press, County-Councillor W. A. Wagstaff, Messrs. T. Gregg, W. R. James, J. Moore, T. Patchett, T. G. Broomhead, G. Spick, J. Ratcliffe Stone, J. B. Dunstan, F. Bingham, T. Swaine, T. Sheppard, J. Clay, etc. In the course of an hour's address, the lecturer dealt with the principal grievances of the people of India, and asked that the electors should urge on their representatives the necessity of removing them by wise legislation.—*Nottingham Evening Express*, April 15th.

According to the *Behar Herald*, the pleaders of the Bankipore Bar have hit upon an original "notion" for collecting funds for supporting the Congress Agency in England. They levy a small tax on their own income. As "sending the hat round" would involve delay, and many would demur to it, they have all agreed to pay one anna on each *vakalatnameh* from their clients. Thus a decent amount is made up without indenting on their private purses, and it is gladly paid. Could not this worthy example be followed more generally throughout the country? There would then be no complaint of want of funds in carrying on agitation at home. The time is not far off, when the decision in regard to the Age of Consent Bill will come before Parliament as a tribunal of the last resort, and our fellow-subjects must gird up their loins for the fray.—*People* (Calcutta).

THE LARGEST AND PUREST HOMŒOPATHIC ESTABLISHMENT IN THE EAST.

LAHIRI & CO.,

Wholesale and Retail HOMŒOPATHIC CHEMISTS AND DRUGGISTS,

101, COLLEGE STREET, CALCUTTA.

BRANCH PHARMACIES: (1) SOVABAZAR; (2) BANKIPORE; (3) PATNA CITY.

Have the largest stock of Homœopathic Medicines, Books, and Sundries imported regularly from ENGLAND, AMERICA and GERMANY.

Catalogues and Price List free by post.

LAHIRI, RAY & CO., PERFUMERS,

103, COLLEGE STREET, CALCUTTA.

We are glad to inform the public that within the short period of our existence we have been favored with patronage from Maharajas, Rajahs, Zemindars, Noblemen, and gentlemen throughout India. We guarantee the best quality and genuineness of our articles, which are prepared under our own supervision.

NOVELTIES IN PERFUMERY.

Attar of Patchouly, per tola .. .. .. Rs. 2
Attar of Lemon Flowers, per tola 3
Attar of Kaora, per tola .. Rs. 2 and Rs. 2-8
Attar of Juin, per tola 2
Attar of Hena, per tola, Rs. 1-8, Rs. 3, Rs. 4 and 5.

CATALOGUE AND PRICE LIST FREE ON APPLICATION.

HUTCHINSON & Co.

Merchants, Bankers, and Agents,

25, CRAVEN ST., CHARING CROSS, LONDON.

AGENTS: Bombay, Bhaisett & Co , Sirdars Buildings, Old Secretariat Fort.

Calcutta, Ker, Tarruk & Co., 11, Clive Street.

CONSIGNMENTS received, realized, and promptly remitted for.

INDENTS and purchases of every description made and forwarded at lowest rates.

PASSENGERS by the P. & O., Orient, British India, and other Lines met by own officials, to take charge of Baggage, clear and deliver it, and otherwise assist Passengers.

CUSTOMS and General Agency. Bills of Lading attended to. Goods cleared at Customs and delivered in any part of United Kingdom, warehoused and otherwise dealt with as instructed.

ARMY, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.

TELEGRAPHIC Remittances of Money to Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras made.

ORDERS on the London Stock Exchange executed.

DEPOSITS at Interest for Fixed Periods and open Current Accounts for the convenience of Constituents in England and India.

STORAGE and Insurance. Agents for the Sun Life and Fire Insurance Company.

INFORMATION promptly furnished. Moneys recovered. Letters carefully considered and answered.

The Representatives of Messrs. HUTCHINSON & Co. board Steamers from the East on their arrival at Gravesend or at the Docks, to take instructions for Clearing and Forwarding Baggage, &c.

Mr. AZIZ AHMAD,

FROM LUCKNOW,

TEACHER OF ARABIC, PERSIAN, HINDUSTANI, &c.

Lecturer on Egypt, Afghanistan, India, &c.

Address:

36, BANK STREET, HILLHEAD, GLASGOW.

PRINTING.

A. BONNER,

34, BOUVERIE ST., LONDON, E.C.

NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, LEAFLETS, Pamphlets, Books, &c.

Commercial, Professional, and General Printing.

GOOD STYLE AND QUALITY.

THE

BELT DRAWERS.

A SPECIALITE IN GENTLEMEN'S UNDERCLOTHING.

The article is formed on a principle that affords to the wearer a nice, gentle, and uniform support to the loins, abdomen, etc., imparting therewith a sense of remarkable comfort, as also a pronounced healthful influence.

Moderate price and excessive durability, rendering the article an economical garment withal.

Makers and Originators of the Article,

SANDLAND & CRANE

Gentlemen's Hosiers,

55, Regent St., London.

(The Quadrant section of the street, and next to Swan and Edgar's.)

Illustrated Prospectus and Price List on Application.

MRS. S. ASSER,

Milliner and Ladies' Outfitter,

MATINEES AND TEA GOWNS

IN THE NEW COTTON CREPE, from 3 to 6 Guineas.

THE JEAAN TEA JACKET,

In Soft Washing Silk, with Lace Sleeves. Transparent or lined a Colour.

ALL KINDS OF WOVEN UNDERWEAR.

IN MILLINERY

The arrangements are entirely new. **very large Hats being the Style affected,** some trimmed with trails of spring flowers, which prove most becoming.

The TUDOR BONNET, in Black and Gold Passmenterie, **21/-**

Very tiny and becoming.

CLEOPATRA COINS, BANDS, and SERPENTS,

In Gilt Jewelled, for Fancy Dress.

NEW DESIGNS IN FANS, from 7/9.	FANS FOR CHILDREN, 6 to 8 in. long. 3/9 to 10/9 specialitie	FANS MOUNTED AND REPAIRED.

To ensure immediate attention, a Cheque or London TRADE Reference must accompany all Orders.

8 & 9, Burlington Arcade, London, W.

W. A. STIMSON,

MILITARY AND DIPLOMATIC TAILOR.

INDIAN OUTFITS.

52, MADDOX STREET,

NEW BOND STREET,

LONDON, W.

WILCOX, WOODROW & Co.

Tailors and Outfitters,

20, PRINCES STREET, HANOVER SQUARE,

LONDON.

THE ASTHMA CURE.

An Indian Remedy. Prepared from a single vegetable root.

An INFALLIBLE REMEDY for this fell disease.

Tried with marvellous effect in many cases of long standing in children, in grown-up people, and in the aged. A single administration of the juice in the Indian climate has almost invariably produced a radical cure. Enquiries in England may be made of

Messrs. HUTCHINSON & CO., 25, CRAVEN STREET, LONDON.

L. M. GHOSE, BHAUGULPUR, BENGAL, INDIA.

Among many Testimonials received are the following:

I have much pleasure in certifying that my second son, who suffered for more ɑan four years from almost monthly fits of asthma of a very severe type, has been cured in a way almost miraculous by a single administration of Doctor Ladli Mahan Ghosh's simple remedy. I gratefully testify to its marvellous effect, and as my child has had no fit for the last three years and has shown signs of increasing health and cheerfulness, I hope that the disease has been radically cured.

PARAPADA GHOSHAL, M.A.

October 12, 1890. *Head Master, Zila School, Bhagalpur.*

Durbhungah, *August* 28, 1890.

The season is coming again for asthma, and we are soon going up to Simla, where you know the climate is too cold and may bring out asthma. I would like you to send me some asthma roots, in case the disease appears I will then be able to stop it. Lots of people come to beg it of me, and so if you can please send a good quantity. Don't fail to send me some by return post; we may return for Simla immediately.

MIRACLE.

DR. W. C. ROY'S

SPECIFIC FOR INSANITY.

Numerous Testimonials.

SOLD at No. 25, Prosunno Cumar Tagore's Street, Calcutta. Price Rs. 5 per phial. Rupee 1, in addition for postage and package.

U. N. BAGCHI, M.A.,

MANUFACTURING CHEMIST.

HINDU TOURISTS' PARTY

TO EUROPE, AMERICA, CHINA, JAPAN and the STRAITS.

HINDU Noblemen and Gentlemen desirous of proceeding to England or any other parts of Europe, to America, or to China, Japan, and the Straits, in the Hindu style, will please communicate with, and send in their names for registration to, the undersigned.

CHARU CHUNDER MITTER

(Of Allahabad and Calcutta),

Care of the Editor, *Indian Mirror*,

74, DHURRUMTOLLAH STREET,

CALCUTTA.

Printed by A. Bonner, 34, Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, London, E.C. and Published by Wm. Digby, 25, Craven Street, Charing Cross, W.C.